

Foreign
Broadcast
Information
Service



ANNIVERSARY
1941 - 1991

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-022
Friday
1 February 1991

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-022

CONTENTS

1 February 1991

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Foreign Ministry's Churkin Holds Briefing 31 Jan	1
Outlines Baltics Troop Withdrawal [TASS]	1
Hopes Gulf War Contained [TASS]	1
On Soviets Leaving Iraq [TASS]	1
Praises Latin American Gulf Role [TASS]	1
On Officials Trips to North Cyprus [TASS]	2
Hails Mandela-Buthelezi Meeting [TASS]	2
United Nations Meeting in Moscow Reviewed [TASS]	2
Motivation of Foreign Aid to USSR Questioned [PRAVDA 29 Jan]	2

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Reports, Commentaries on Bessmertnykh U.S. Visit	4
Interviewed on Gulf Discussions [Moscow TV]	4
Greater Understanding Seen [TASS]	4
Joint Statement Analyzed [Moscow International]	5
Comparison of Joint Statement	5
Rostov Businessman Offers Aid for Gulf Effort [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 29 Jan]	5
Soviet-U.S. Consultative Session Opens [TASS]	5

Northeast Asia

Economic Ties With ROK To Mean Peace, Stability [Moscow International]	5
--	---

Near East & South Asia

Belonogov, Yemeni Official Discuss Gulf, Ties [TASS]	6
Military Officials Interviewed on Gulf War	6
Allied, Iraqi Weaponry Eyed [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 31 Jan]	6
Order To Leave Iraq Noted [RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 26 Jan]	8
Expert on U.S. Views Gulf's Political Prospects [Budapest NEPSZABADSAG 28 Jan]	8
Israeli Official Queried on Retaliation [TRUD 29 Jan]	9
Assessments on Gulf War, Consequences Noted	10
Iran's Neutrality Questioned [IZVESTIYA 30 Jan]	10
Iraqi Terrorist Threat Viewed [Moscow Radio]	11
Damage Seen as Troubling [PRAVDA 31 Jan]	11
Allied, Iraqi Ground Reserves Eyed [TRUD 29 Jan]	12
Prospects for Ground Offensive Seen [IZVESTIYA 29 Jan]	13
IZVESTIYA Reports Iraqi Aircraft in Iran [28 Jan]	13
Afghan Envoy Discusses Regional Issues [TASS]	14

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Gorbachev Opens Federation Council Meeting [TASS]	15
---	----

CPSU Central, Control Committees Hold Plenum	15
Communique Issued [TASS]	15
Plenum Adopts Political Statement [TASS]	16
Overview of Plenum [TASS]	16
Silayev Says Price Rise Decree To Be Issued [AFP]	17
Presidium Seeks IZVESTIYA Editor's Dismissal [Radio Rossii]	17
Workers Oppose Removal [Moscow Radio]	18
Major Jailed for 'Attempted Betrayal' [TASS]	18

Economic

Economist Evaluates Bank Note Exchange [IZVESTIYA 26 Jan]	18
Economist on Problems of Ruble Exchange [ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 4]	20
Official Cited on Price Rise Rumors [PRAVDA 30 Jan]	21
Republican Economic Sovereignty Viewed [PRAVDA 30 Jan]	22

Military

General Staff Directorate Chief on Joint Patrols [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 30 Jan]	23
Navy Captain Describes Munitions Dumped in 1947 [IZVESTIYA 26 Jan]	24
Army Colleagues Condemn Western Forces Deserter [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 Jan]	25

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Troops Said To Increase Strength in Lithuania [TASS]	26
Lithuania Leaders on 'Anxiety' Over Army Patrols [Radio Vilnius]	26
Military Sees No Need To Patrol in Siauliai [Radio Vilnius]	27
Lithuanian Government Calls for 'Passive Protest' [Vilnius International]	27
Supreme Council Urges Civic Solidarity [Radio Vilnius]	27
Landsbergis Addresses Council [Radio Vilnius]	27
Calls 'To Be Ready for Resistance' [TASS]	28
Landsbergis Praises Peoples' Resolve in Crisis [Budapest Radio]	28
Troops Moved From FRG Said To Cause 'Trouble' [Radio Vilnius]	28
Vilnius Reports Iceland Recognizes Independence [Radio Vilnius]	28
Iceland Confirms Restored Ties [Radio Vilnius]	29
Lithuania's Vagnorius on Relations With Moscow [Budapest NEPSZAVA 28 Jan]	29
Saudargas Sees 'No Advantage' in Moscow Talks [Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD 24 Jan]	30
Prunskiene Discusses Resignation, Baltic Events [KOMSMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 29 Jan]	31
MOSCOW NEWS Journalists Visit Vilnius [Radio Vilnius]	32
Landsbergis Receives Journalists [Radio Vilnius]	33
Paper Reviews Latest Developments in Lithuania [IZVESTIYA 30 Jan]	33
'Missing Persons' in Lithuania's Reappear 28 Jan [IZVESTIYA 30 Jan]	33
Latvia Rejects Gorbachev Decree on Joint Patrols [Riga Radio]	34
Gorbunovs, Godmanis To Attend Federation Council [Riga Radio]	34
Gorbunovs Backs Referendum; People's Front Opposed [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 30 Jan]	34
Guards Sent to Belorussia; Return Demanded [Riga Radio]	34
Deputy Procurator General on Riga Inquiry Process [Moscow TV]	35
Garrison Official Explains No Confidence Vote [Moscow TV]	35
Officers Denied Vote for Riga City Soviet [IZVESTIYA 29 Jan]	35
Latvian Group Backs Gorbachev Steps on Lithuania [SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 17 Jan]	36
Recognizes Salvation Committee [SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 17 Jan]	36
Arrested Latvian Trawler Arrives in Dakar [PRAVDA 30 Jan]	36
Estonian Legislature To Hold Referendum 3 March [TASS]	36
Estonian People's Front Wants 4 March Referendum [Moscow Radio]	36
IZVESTIYA Views Estonian Plans for Referendum [IZVESTIYA 1 Feb]	37
Estonian Presidium Statement on Joint Patrols [Tallinn TV]	37
Commander Says Army Not To Work With Militia [Tallinn Radio]	38
Estonia Said To Yield to Moscow on Draft Issue [Stockholm Radio]	38
Differences Between Estonia, Other Baltics Viewed [Tallinn TV]	38

Two Women Detained in Tallinn Murder Case	[Swedish Radio]	39
Baltics Groups Appeal to RSFSR, Gorbachev	[Moscow TV]	39
Baltic MD Chief Offers 'Stabilization' Proposals	[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 15 Jan]	39
Analyst Sees 'Compromise' Emerging in Baltics	[TASS]	40

RSFSR

RSFSR Supreme Soviet Session 31 Jan	[Moscow TV]	41
Joint Patrols Set To Begin in Moscow	[Moscow TV]	45
Legislature Adopts Appeal	[Moscow Radio]	45
Presidium Rejects Armed Forces Use	[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 31 Jan]	46
Yeltsin on Opposition to Patrols	[Moscow TV]	46
Deputies Call for Gorbachev, Pavlov Resignation	[TASS]	46
Silayev To Present Budget, Pricing Policy	[TASS]	47
Moscow Forms Commission on Military Issues	[Moscow Radio]	47
Spokesman Notes Interrepublic Agreement Progress	[TASS]	47
Democratic Party Head on Prospects of New Union	[Moscow TV]	47
Kabardino-Balkaria ASSR Proclaims Sovereignty	[TASS]	47
Trade Unions, Russian Government Sign Accord	[Moscow TV]	48
Correspondent Examines RSFSR Legislature Actions	[Moscow Radio]	48
Silayev Meets With Peasant Farmers	[Radio Rossii]	48
Moscow City Executive Committee Team Elected	[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 18 Jan]	48
RSFSR 'Rubles for Dollars' Deal Explained	[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 26 Jan]	49
Polozkov Assesses Markets, Socialism	[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 22 Jan]	52

Western Republics

Belorussian Legislature Views Banknote Exchange	[Moscow Radio]	54
Moldova Fails To Ratify Patrols Decree	[TASS]	54
Moldova Republican Budget Law Examined	[TASS]	54
Readers Criticize Yeltsin's 'Destructive' Actions	[PRAVDA 24 Jan]	54
Moldovan Deputies Receive Threats of Violence	[Moscow Radio]	55
Former Dissident Hits Moldovan 'Anticommunism'	[IZVESTIYA 28 Jan]	55
800 Romanians Seek Moldovan Citizenship	[Moscow Radio]	55

Caucasus

Georgian President Says Patrols Would Prompt War	[Budapest Radio]	56
MVD Officer on Role of Troops in Ossetia	[TRUD 26 Jan]	56
Russian-Language Paper Closed Down in Georgia	[PRAVDA 26 Jan]	57
Armenian Legislature Rejects Union Referendum	[Yerevan Radio]	57
Armenian Premier Rejects Draft Union Treaty	[Yerevan Radio]	58
Foteyev Meets With Officers in Stepanakert	[Moscow Radio]	58
Azerbaijan, Turkey Sign Cooperation Protocol	[Baku Radio]	58

Central Asia

Uzbekistan Supports 17 Mar Referendum	[PRAVDA 30 Jan]	59
Turkmen Draft Law on Local Self-Management	[cross-reference]	59
Uzbek Law on Trade Abuses, Speculation	[cross-reference]	59

Foreign Ministry's Churkin Holds Briefing 31 Jan

Outlines Baltics Troop Withdrawal

LD3101143291 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1401 GMT 31 Jan 91

[By TASS correspondents Igor Peskov, Oleg Polovko, and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow, 31 Jan, (TASS)—Only those subunits of the USSR Armed Forces that were permanently deployed in the Baltic republics will remain there, Vitaliy Churkin, head of the information directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, said at a briefing here today for Soviet and foreign journalists. In doing so, he quoted remarks made by USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh during his visit to the United States.

Vitaliy Churkin, said that the Soviet minister talked publicly in Washington about one paratroop regiment being withdrawn from the Baltics which had been sent there from near Pskov and which is currently returning to its permanent station. In addition, some reduction of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs troops currently stationed in the Baltic republics will be carried out.

Hopes Gulf War Contained

LD3101145791 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1350 GMT 31 Jan 91

[By TASS correspondents Igor Peskov, Oleg Polovko and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow, 31 Jan (TASS)—The Soviet Union hopes that the conflict in the Persian Gulf will not go "beyond the already rather dangerous framework." This is how Vitaliy Churkin, head of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration, during today's briefing defined the USSR's position on the possibility of NATO's participation in the war.

Replying to a question from journalists about Moscow's attitude to the possibility of such a development given reports on the concentration of Iraqi troops on the Turkish border the diplomat stressed that worries persist that the conflict may widen and get out of control. "It is hoped that it does not go outside the already rather dangerous framework," Vitaliy Churkin stated.

At the same time the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman did not venture to give more detailed comments on what he called this "hypothetical" issue.

The question asked at the briefing draws attention to a report from Brussels on strengthening Turkey's anti-aircraft defenses, a decision adopted as a result of NATO's appeal to the allied states' governments to support Turkey—which has a border with Iraq—to defend its airspace from possible air attacks. According to a statement made this week by the official spokesman of the North Atlantic Alliance, a squadron comprising

warplanes of six member countries is also being sent to the Mediterranean region for patrol operations.

On Soviets Leaving Iraq

LD3101220991 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1450 GMT 31 Jan 91

[By TASS correspondents Igor Peskov, Oleg Polovko, and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Excerpts] Moscow, 31 Jan (TASS)—[passage omitted] The Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vitaliy Churkin, informed journalists that 32 members of staff of the Soviet Embassy in Iraq will be returning to Moscow tonight from Tehran aboard a scheduled Aeroflot flight. He noted that 13 Soviet diplomats remain in Baghdad. Referring to six journalists "who decided of their own accord to travel to Iraq and refused to leave that country in time, permission for them to leave has been received from the Iraqi authorities." [passage omitted]

Vitaliy Churkin reported that a routine meeting of the joint commission monitoring the settlement in South-west Africa was held in Cape Town on 29 and 30 January. A Soviet delegation took part in it, as it did in the previous meetings.

At the end of the briefing, Churkin denied recent reports on radio and television in the CSFR about an incident alleged to have taken place on the Soviet-Czechoslovak border. It is said that an armed group tried to force its way out of the USSR and into Czechoslovakia. These reports are "fictitious and do not correspond to reality," Vitaliy Churkin declared.

Praises Latin American Gulf Role

LD3101211791 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1359 GMT 31 Jan 91

[By TASS correspondents Igor Peskov, Oleg Polovko, and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow, 31 Jan (TASS)—The Soviet Union welcomes the growing striving by Latin American states to take a more active part in seeking ways to settle the crisis in the Persian Gulf, now that it is essential to mobilize the efforts of the whole world community in this sphere. This was stated at a briefing today by Vitaliy Churkin, head of the information directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry. He commented on the results of the special meeting held a few days ago in the Venezuelan capital of foreign ministers of the Rio Group member countries. The meeting considered the situation in the Persian Gulf zone and its possible negative consequences for the countries of the Latin American region.

The Soviet diplomat emphasized in this connection that "the decision adopted in Caracas to give a special committee, made up of Colombia, Chile, and Ecuador, the task of carefully following developments in the

Persian Gulf and drawing up specific proposals to facilitate the achievement of peace in that region, is of great importance."

On Officials Trips to North Cyprus

LD3101152691 Moscow TASS in English 1510 GMT 31 Jan 91

[By TASS correspondents Igor Peskov, Oleg Plovko and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow January 31 (TASS)—The recent trips of some legislators of various levels and representatives of some Union republics to the so-called "Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus" should be regarded as private and unofficial, Soviet Foreign Ministry Vitaliy Churkin said at a briefing here today.

According to Churkin, the Soviet Union, like the world community in general with the exception of Turkey, "does not recognise the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus and does not maintain any official contacts with it. We are consistently fulfilling Resolution 541 of the U.N. Security Council, which urged all countries to recognise no other state in Cyprus but the Republic of Cyprus. The Soviet Union supports the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the republic of Cyprus," Churkin stressed.

Hails Mandela-Buthelezi Meeting

LD3101203891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1347 GMT 31 Jan 91

[By TASS correspondents Igor Peskov, Oleg Polovko, and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow, 31 Jan (TASS)—Vitaliy Churkin, head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry, has described the meeting on 29 January between the vice president of the African National Congress [Nelson Mandela] and Mangosuthu Gatsha Buthelezi, the leader of the Inkatha Freedom Party, as important and timely. Addressing a briefing here today, he noted that such a meeting had been needed for a long time. Its positive outcome could help to bring an end to the bloody clashes in the African townships, heal the situation in the country, and initiate as soon as possible full-scale talks on the democratic restructuring of South Africa.

"I hope," Vitaliy Churkin stressed, "that this meeting will be a step toward consolidating forces that advocate the use of political means to eliminate apartheid."

United Nations Meeting in Moscow Reviewed

LD3101200291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1207 GMT 31 Jan 91

[By TASS correspondents Mikhail Ivanov and Vladimir Petrov]

[Summary] Moscow 31 Jan (TASS)—The task set by those organizing the meeting "The UN Organization on the Frontier of the 21st Century" set themselves was to acquaint the Soviet public with the activities of the United Nations. Highly-placed UN representatives took part in the meeting, such as Therese Paquet Sevigny, the UN under general secretary for public information. Representatives of more than 100 USSR non-governmental organizations also took part.

The significance of this meeting from the point of view of the USSR is demonstrated by the fact that the meeting was addressed by Aleksandr Dzasokhov, a member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet international affairs committee, as well as by Vladimir Petrovskiy, a USSR deputy foreign minister. A UN delegation was also received by Gennadiy Yanayev, the USSR vice president, and by Anatoliy Lukyanov, the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

At a news conference, Valentina Tereshkova said that the forum had fulfilled all that was expected of it and confirmed the mutual interest of Soviet non-governmental organizations and the United Nations in improving bilateral cooperation.

Motivation of Foreign Aid to USSR Questioned

PM3101143491 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jan 91 First Edition p 5

["My Opinion" article by Vladislav Drobkov: "'No Such Thing as a Free Lunch'"]

[Text] This popular American saying came to mind as soon as calls again started coming from abroad to "punish" the USSR by blocking channels of Western aid. Now that a number of capitals have decided to switch from calling to acting, this expression, with all its cynical directness, could be a fine illustration of the true intentions and aims of certain "donors," as those granting economic or other assistance are known in the West.

I must say right away that in no way would I cast doubt on the sincere and noble impulse of ordinary citizens in dozens of foreign countries, who are currently sending us food and other parcels for our old people, sick people, and orphans. I deeply respect and cordially thank them for their kindness, although it is shameful that we ourselves are not capable of protecting the interests of our country's least fortunate inhabitants at this dramatic and difficult time of radical changes in its fate.

I am talking about aid of a different kind. Aid already promised or being given to us by the United States and Germany, Japan [PRAVDA 29 January Second Edition version omits the word "Japan" at this point] and France, and other countries, the European Community, and major Western companies and banks; the billions of dollars, marks, francs, and lire given in order to promote the process of perestroika in the USSR, and for which we have already expressed our gratitude. And now it

turns out that some of the "donors" are prepared to hold back their billions in aid, which mainly takes the form of credits for which, incidentally, we still have to pay. Some people explain this change in terms of the events in the Baltic, some in terms of the "danger of a move to the right on the part of the regime in the USSR," and some put forward conditions that smack strongly of unconcealed interference in our internal affairs. Similar resolutions and decisions are being adopted by the American Senate, EC ministers, and legislators in a number of West European states.

Countries and organizations that grant any kind of aid or offer credits are undeniably free to set what terms they like. But in that case let them stipulate openly, in advance, all the terms on which they give us support at this level. We rich folk, they could say, are prepared to help you poor folk to cope with your problems on such-and-such conditions. And do not deviate by a single step. As the saying goes—a step to the right or a step to the left constitutes desertion. Running in place is a provocation.... In that event we too are free in each specific case to consider once again whether it is worth accepting gifts on these terms. Especially since in some cases they cannot be called gifts—the "gifts" have to be repaid with interest.

From the moral point of view, for instance, a modest parcel from German pensioners is far more precious to me than an American billion in "food aid" which is used to subsidise purchases by us—and on a credit basis, moreover—of American feed grain. Who benefits most from aid like that? We ourselves, who grew a record harvest last year, or the farmers of the American "corn belt," who do not know where to sell their surpluses? In my view, if this same billion was used to buy prefabricated grain storage facilities and equipment for elevators, so that our own grain did not rot in pits, it would be of great benefit to our economy. As things stand, the feed grain from across the ocean will once again fill our obsolete ports and storage facilities for months on end, occupy the holds of our own ships and chartered ships, and eventually be eaten up, leaving nothing behind. But

what about next year, must we again go looking for "aid," adding further billions to the foreign debt? Is not this form of "aid" only too ruinous?

At the moment many publications both here and abroad are fond of calculating what could be the total sum of promised aid refused, if the Western "donors" deem our behavior to merit punishment. Some people make it \$10 billion, some \$16 billion, or even more. But for some reason no one is making any attempt to calculate the very tangible economic losses that could result, for us, from blindly following various "donors'" wishes. I believe that only the sudden collapse of the USSR into petty princedoms, [second edition version here adds "which certain 'donors' dream of,"] and the rapid disintegration of traditional economic ties, to say nothing of human tragedies, will inflict damage upon us of a kind that no givers of gifts, however generous, can make good.

And another point: In recent months we have increasingly frequently come across reports on how carelessly and stupidly foreign aid and credits are sometimes used. In one place equipment worth many millions is rusting under the snow, because they were in a hurry to buy it before the shops where it was to be sited had been built. In another place hundreds of freightcars and whole ships full of imported meat are not being unloaded. In a third, they cannot decide what to spend the incoming billions on. It seems to be a law of nature: Gifts corrupt, sap the will to seek internal reserves and prudent reliance on one's own forces. It is always easier to accept credits and put your hand in the pockets of future generations. But the fact is that not even massive foreign aid has fed all the hungry in Ethiopia or saved Latin America or Africa from their long slavery.

Perhaps we should decide beforehand right now, in view of all the fuss and the claims by certain former "benefactors," whose sincere aid and support, not linked to unjustified terms, we can accept and—this is particularly important—use beneficially in our national interests, and which it is better to refuse politely, like a free lunch for which an excessive bill may be presented later.

United States & Canada**Reports, Commentaries on Bessmertnykh U.S. Visit****Interviewed on Gulf Discussions**

LD3001201791 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 30 Jan 91

[Interview with Foreign Minister Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Bessmertnykh by correspondent Boris Kalyagin in Washington on 30 January; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] [Kalyagin] Aleksandr Aleksandrovich, what agreements have been reached as a result of your talks with the secretary of state?

[Bessmertnykh] We have issued a joint statement on the Persian Gulf and also on the Near East. We have one such important document. We consider that a cease-fire is possible. For this, of course, Saddam Husayn must announce very distinctly and clearly that he is withdrawing his troops from Kuwait. The aggression must be halted.

At the same time, I want to stress that probably for the first time since 1976 two ministers have spoken jointly on the Near East. This is a very important circumstance, I consider. That is, we have tried to look beyond the limits of the present conflict in the Persian Gulf region and agree that the settlement, the just settlement of the Near East problem, the achievement of an honorable and just solution to the Palestinian issue, is the next most important priority for our two countries.

[Announcer] Today the USSR foreign minister returned to Moscow.

Greater Understanding Seen

LD3001140591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1200 GMT 30 Jan 91

[By TASS political observer Askold Biryukov]

[Text] Moscow, 30 Jan (TASS)—The talks which ended in Washington Tuesday [29 January] between the heads of the diplomatic departments of the USSR and the United States and which touched on a wide range of bilateral relations and global and regional problems turned out to be concrete and productive despite the skepticism displayed in certain quarters. The main thing is that they widened the base of mutual understanding between Moscow and Washington and made it possible to map out the prospects for further cooperation between them.

From the results of the negotiations I would like to single out the joint Soviet-U.S. statement on the Persian Gulf. It is no secret that voices of alarm have been sounding more and more loudly in recent days in various countries, including the United States and the USSR, saying that actions of the multinational forces, the backbone of

which is comprised by the U.S. Armed Forces, are increasingly going beyond the framework of the tasks defined for them by the UN mandate; and that these forces, instead of liberating Kuwait which has been subjected to Iraqi aggression, are being drawn increasingly into war on the territory of Iraq, inflicting on that country mass destruction and casualties among its peaceful population. Participants in antiwar demonstrations, which have been gathering strength recently, ask the following questions: "What are the aims for which the United States is going to war in the Persian Gulf? Is it not, having destroyed Iraq, to establish its own domination over world oil stocks and thus over the whole world?"

It is gratifying that—as was stressed by the American side during the talks which have ended—the United States and its partners are "seeking the liberation of Kuwait and not the destruction of Iraq," and are "doing everything incumbent on them to avoid casualties among the civil population and are not interested in widening the conflict." The USSR and the United States expressed the view that everything possible should be done in order to avoid further escalation of the war and an extension of its scale. The statement by the ministers of the two powers about the possibility of ending military actions against Iraq altogether if the latter gives a clear pledge to leave Kuwait and immediately backs that up with specific steps leading to the complete fulfillment of the UN Security Council resolution gives rise to special satisfaction. In my view, that statement represents a step forward in the position taken so far by the U.S. Administration and it would be disappointing if the Iraqi leadership does not take this chance to put an end to the war.

One other provision contained in the joint statement draws attention to itself. Talking about the tasks of establishing firm peace and stability in the region after the conflict in the Persian Gulf has ended, the ministers pointed out that the removal of the sources of the conflicts and instability—including the Arab-Israeli source—will be of special importance. Both ministers agreed that this is impossible "without a full-blooded peace process, promoting a just peace, security, and genuine reconciliation between Israel, the Arab states, and the Palestinians," the statement says. They expressed the opinion that overcoming the crisis in the Persian Gulf will ease considerably and will make it possible to step up joint efforts by the USSR and the United States taken in contact with other parties in the region in order to promote peace between the Arabs and Israel and regional security.

Putting things in that way seems to me to be one more move in the former position of the United States and it makes it easier to achieve firm peace and stability. I think that this kind of approach on the part of the USSR and the United States to issues of a peaceful settlement in the Persian Gulf zone and in the whole of the region will be welcomed by all members of the international community.

Joint Statement Analyzed

LD3001155191 Moscow World Service in English
1210 GMT 30 Jan 91

[Excerpts] The Soviet Union and the United States have issued a joint statement on the Persian Gulf. The statement was agreed on by the Soviet foreign minister, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, and the American secretary of state, James Baker. Our commentator Yuriy Solton analyzes the statement.

[Solton] The main and most important thing about the statement is the fact that the statement gives an answer of the principle to the question upmost in all the people's minds: when and how the Persian Gulf War will end, a war whose scale acquires threatening character. [passage omitted]

The Iraqi president, Saddam Husayn, obviously underestimated in the past the reaction of the world community to the capture of Kuwait. Now, too, it seems that he continues to assess the situation inadequately. He reasons philosophically that the Gulf War is between good and evil, and that he naturally personifies good, that he will win the war if he will have to use the weapons of mass destruction and cause an ecological disaster. The Soviet-American statement is another warning to the Arab leader. [passage omitted]

Just as other countries, the Soviet Union is not giving up the search for political methods of affecting Iraq. [passage omitted] But no one should doubt the fact that Moscow will not budge an inch off its stand of principle. The decisions of the United Nations Security Council about driving the Iraqi aggressor from Kuwait must be carried out to the full.

Comparison of Joint Statement

PM3001153991

Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian on 31 January 1991 carries in its Union Edition on page 4 a report on the joint statement issued 29 January by U.S. Secretary of State Baker and Soviet Foreign Minister Bessmertnykh. The IZVESTIYA item, headlined "Soviet-U.S. Joint Statement," has been compared with the translation of the Moscow TASS International Russian version, published in the 30 January Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, pp 9-10, revealing the following variations:

Page 9, column two, paragraph one, sentence one begins: [Text] U.S. Secretary of... (omit dateline)

Same sentence reads: ...the Persian Gulf. It says:

In the course... (omitting passage, picking up next paragraph, rewording)

Page 10, paragraph two, last sentence reads: ...UN Security Council resolutions.

The Iraqi leadership.... (substituting "resolutions" for "resolution")

Rostov Businessman Offers Aid for Gulf Effort

PM3101141791 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jan 91 p 2

[Report by S. Sineok under the general headline: "No Scrooge..."]

[Text] Rostov businessman Viktor Chepurnov has taken a step which will possibly affect the Persian Gulf situation. A telegram sent by him to the U.S. ambassador to the USSR says:

"Esteemed Mr. Ambassador: I started my business only recently, but it has already given me rather decent profits by Soviet standards. I would like to send a part of them—1,000 rubles—to help the anti-Iraq coalition troops and reward the man who takes Saddam Husayn prisoner. In the event of his death this money will be transferred to the Kuwaiti Government to help war victims. Although this sum is small by your standards, it is of great importance to me. I hope that my symbolic contribution will help a very quick victory to be won over the aggressor."

Soviet-U.S. Consultative Session Opens

LD2901183191 Moscow TASS in English 1810 GMT
29 Jan 91

[Text] Geneva January 29 TASS—A regular session of the Soviet-American permanent consultative commission opened here today.

The commission was instituted in accordance with the December 21, 1972, memorandum of understanding between the Governments of the Soviet Union and the United States on promoting the attainment of the goals and implementing the provisions of the agreement between the USSR and the U.S. on the limitation of strategic arms and on measures to reduce the risk of an outbreak of nuclear war.

Northeast Asia

Economic Ties With ROK To Mean Peace, Stability

SK0102012291 Moscow International Service
in Korean 1100 GMT 29 Jan 91

[Commentary by station commentator (Igor Sedov) from the "Focus On Asia" program]

[Text] The second Soviet-ROK intergovernmental talks on the promotion of trade and economic and scientific and technological cooperation, which were recently held in Seoul, have remained as the focus of attention by the Soviet media. Our station commentator (Igor Sedov) writes on this:

Deputy Soviet Prime Minister Yuriy Maslyukov, head of the Soviet delegation, and ROK Presidential Economic Adviser Kim Chong-in, head of the ROK delegation, have reached an important practical agreement. The

ROK side agreed to make loans totalling \$3 billion to the Soviet Union. The promotion of reciprocal economic ties was also discussed. An agreement on cooperation, in fisheries was initiated that will enable economic enterprises of the two countries to jointly catch fish on an equal footing, and an agreement was also reached to sign agreements for intergovernmental cooperation in aviation and communications. The Seoul talks focused on making joint efforts to develop natural resources in Siberia and the Far East. For example, in 1991, the two countries will have joint feasibility studies on a total of seven projects for the development of natural gas in Yakutsk; copper and coal in Chita; [word indistinct] and natural gas in Sakhalin; and other natural resources. The seven projects will also include a petrochemical plant in (?Irkutsk) and refineries in (Ankarts) and (Tachinsk). At a time when the United States and Japan have been reluctant to transfer their high technology to the ROK, Seoul has shown deep interest in scientific and technological cooperation with the Soviet Union. Therefore, it was decided that during the first quarter of this year, the science and technology ministers of the Soviet Union and the ROK will hold a meeting of the joint nuclear coordination committee and will sign an agreement on cooperation in industrial standards.

The extensive development of economic ties between the Soviet Union and the ROK has called for establishing a permanent coordination organization. The Intergovernmental Economic and Scientific and Technological Cooperation Committee will be established as an organization of this nature.

Finally, (Igor Sedov) writes: The second intergovernmental talks held in Seoul has served as an important opportunity to promote trade and economic ties between the Soviet Union and the ROK.

The two countries firmly believe that such ties would contribute to promoting peace and stability on the Korean peninsula and strengthening stability and cooperation in this region and the world in general.

Near East & South Asia

Belonogov, Yemeni Official Discuss Gulf, Ties

LD3101210891 Moscow TASS in English 2045 GMT
31 Jan 91

[Text] Moscow January 31 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Aleksandr Belonogov and Yemeni Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of the Yemen Republic 'Abd-al-'Aziz al-Dali held consultations here today.

They focused their attention on the acute problems dealing with the Gulf conflict and the need to stop it as soon as possible.

The Yemeni minister was informed in detail about various efforts exerted by the Soviet Union with the aim to achieve a political settlement of the crisis. In this connection 'abd al-'Aziz al-Dali expressed satisfaction

over the content of the Soviet-American statement on the Gulf, made on January 29, and its orientation towards a comprehensive settlement of crisis situations in the Middle East.

During the consultations they also discussed a further development of Soviet-Yemeni relations. Both sides expressed interest in keeping them stable, friendly and favourable for the consolidation of comprehensive cooperation between the Soviet Union and the Yemen Republic.

Military Officials Interviewed on Gulf War

Allied, Iraqi Weaponry Eyed

PM3101114491 Moscow KRSNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 31 Jan 91 First Edition p 3

[Interview with Major General S. Bogdanov, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff Center for Operational and Strategic Studies, by Lieutenant Colonel V. Nikanorov; place and date not given: "Maj. Gen. S. Bogdanov: 'The General Staff Is Closely Monitoring the Developing Situation'"]

[Text] It is two weeks since the war started in the Persian Gulf. We asked Major General S. Bogdanov, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff Center for Operational and Strategic Studies, to answer a number of questions of concern to KRSNAYA ZVEZDA readers.

[Nikanorov] Today it is obvious that the "blitzkrieg" that the Americans were, to all appearances, counting on in the Near East has not worked. The war is beginning to become protracted. At the same time, there are categorical assertions in the press that military defeat for Iraq in this war is a foregone conclusion. What is your opinion on this?

[Bogdanov] I would not jump to conclusions. This is a very serious question, and there can be no unequivocal answer. Certainly, the combined military potential of the forces of the anti-Iraq coalition markedly exceeds Iraq's military potential. All the same, it must not be underestimated. Baghdad has a sufficient arsenal to inflict appreciable damage on the enemy. Moreover, as the press rightly notes, this could mean not only strikes by "Scud" missiles, but also the use of French-made "Exocet" missiles against U.S. ships, as well as the use of so-called nonconventional types of weapons (chemical, bacteriological). So I would not venture to predict without reservation an inevitable defeat for Iraq, based on an analysis only of the first days of military operations. Judging from the huge forces the allies are bringing up, they are aware that there will be no easy victory. This is also indicated by the request sent to the U.S. President by the Pentagon that a special directive be adopted extending to two years the term for which reservists are drafted into active military service, and that the Defense Department be granted powers to draft additional contingents of reserves.

But that is not the whole story. In discussing the war in the Near East you cannot only talk about purely military aspects of the problem. The political side of the question should not be forgotten. It is very complex. While unanimously advocating the liberation of Kuwait, the countries of the anti-Iraq coalition are far from unanimous on the question of the acceptable level of damage to Iraq or that country's fate. After all, it is beyond doubt that as the war goes on the human and material losses will increase enormously. The logic of the development of hostilities itself, with the use of ground forces, could put on the agenda the question of an extension of the scale of the war and the total destruction of Iraq's military-industrial potential. It is well known that the United Nations did not give the multinational forces a mandate for that.

[Nikanorov] What is your attitude to the idea that is being persistently put forward in certain mass media, that this war has clearly revealed the superiority of American weapons over the Soviet weapons in Iraq's armory?

[Bogdanov] I do not think that is the right way to put it. Assertions on the superiority of American weapons over Soviet are based mainly on comparisons of the Soviet-made operational-tactical missile complex known in the West as "Scud," with the American "Patriot" air defense missile complex.

Setting aside the fact that this comparison is invalid—there are different types of weapons for different purposes—it must be acknowledged that the "Patriot" is indeed a pretty effective weapon. But this system was developed only recently—in the mid-eighties—and subsequent modernization has given it the potential to combat tactical and operational-tactical missiles, especially those without special air defense penetration aids. The "Scud" system, however, was developed more than 30 years ago (these missiles entered the Soviet Army's armory in 1962). Moreover the modernization of "Scud" missiles carried out with the FRG's help gave them a considerably greater range (they have even been given new names—"Al-Husayn" and "Al-Abbas"), with no improvement, and perhaps even a deterioration, in their other tactical and technical characteristics.

As for the other types of weapons, particularly tanks, of which Iraq has mainly Soviet-made versions, no conclusions can be drawn as yet, since neither side has used them yet.

It must be observed that the multinational forces, first and foremost the Americans, are using the Near East as a kind of testing range for the latest models of weapons and combat hardware, up to and including systems of which series production began last year. Take, for instance, the American "SLAM" air-to-surface guided missile, which is equipped with a television homing head. Developed on the basis of the "Harpoon" antiship missile, it went into series production less than two months ago—in December of last year. This missile is in

the armory of U.S. Navy carrier-borne aircraft, which are being used actively for strikes against Iraqi military and economic targets. The command of the multinational forces is devoting great attention to perfecting ways of conducting hostilities by night. Here the latest achievements of military technology are also being used. For instance, British "Lynx" helicopters are fitted with infrared imaging devices for target spotting and illumination; it had been planned to begin using these devices only in 1991. The devices make it possible to attack tanks in total darkness. The "Gazelle" helicopter's laser system is designed for similar purposes. The latest British antiradar air-to-surface guided missile has also come into use in the battlefield. It could be said that in the course of the Near East war this missile is in effect undergoing the final stage of testing, before being accepted into the armory. The same could be said of certain other models of combat hardware and armaments.

They may, of course, be superior to corresponding models in the possession of Iraq, which were produced several years or even decades ago. But it does not follow that Iraq is unarmed. It should also be remembered that in any war the outcome is determined ultimately not so much by the technology as by the people in control of it.

[Nikanorov] There have recently been persistent rumors in the West that military cooperation between the USSR and Iraq is supposedly continuing. Are there any grounds for these rumors?

[Bogdanov] It is a pure fabrication! In full accordance with UN Security Council resolutions, since August last year the Soviet Union has not delivered to Iraq any items of arms, combat equipment, or spare parts. Soviet military specialists have also left Iraq. The USSR Defense Ministry gave an official explanation on all these matters the other day. It also refuted assertions in THE WASHINGTON TIMES that the corresponding Soviet Armed Forces organs are supplying intelligence information to the Iraqi Army.

Then the American newspaper PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER, citing American intelligence staffers, launched an entirely different "canard"—about Soviet representatives supposedly transferring to the Americans secret data on the Iraqi Army's arms. This is also a malicious fabrication. The intention is to arouse suspicion about our position not only on the part of the two sides involved in the conflict, but also in other countries.

[Nikanorov] Does this conflict represent a direct threat to our country? Have any additional measures been taken in this connection in our southern military districts?

[Bogdanov] There are no grounds at the moment to speak of a direct threat. But it must not be forgotten that the war is taking place only a few hundred kilometers from our southern borders. So we have reason to feel a degree of concern. Especially since there is an ever increasing likelihood of an increase in the scale of the

conflict, the involvement of more countries, and the use by both sides of various types of weapons of mass destruction.

Certain Western specialists have no doubt that the American command has plans for low-yield nuclear strikes against Iraq if the latter resorts to chemical weapons. But even if the idea of a deliberate nuclear strike is rejected, it is impossible to rule out a simple accident, a computer error, or even subversion. In war the chances of this are far greater than in peacetime. There is no guarantee that in this situation it will be possible to keep the situation under control.

None of this inspires optimism. The USSR Armed Forces General Staff is carefully monitoring the development of the situation in the Persian Gulf region, in order to respond appropriately to any change in the situation should the need arise. For the time being, in our view, no emergency measures are necessary in our southern districts. Ordinary combat training is continuing there.

Order To Leave Iraq Noted

91UM0323A Moscow *RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA*
in Russian 26 Jan 91 p 3

[Interview with Major General A. Bannikov, former chief of the group of Soviet military specialists in Iraq, by Sergey Doronin; place and date not given: "The General Was the Last One"]

[Text] The position of the Soviet Union on events in the Persian Gulf zone is clear-cut and unambiguous. We are in favor of restoring peace in the region. Iraq must comply with the demands of the world community and withdraw its troops from Kuwait.

Some people in the West would like to refute this obvious position; instigative rumors and fantasies continue to be disseminated about 150 military advisers being in Iraq.

Major General A. Bannikov, the former chief of the group of Soviet military specialists in Iraq, testifies that this is not so. He is now in the Motherland; he is vacationing together with his family in the vicinity of Leningrad. The editorial office of *RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA* contacted him by phone. We offer you a transcript of the conversation:

[Doronin] Anatoliy Vasilyevich, when did your service assignment end?

[Bannikov] I left Baghdad on 9 January of this year. You can see that this was before the beginning of hostilities. The remnants, if I may call them so, of my staff and two translators returned to the Motherland with me.

[Doronin] Therefore, no other military specialists from our country remain in Iraq?

[Bannikov] Precisely. The captain is the last one to leave the ship. I was this very "captain."

[Doronin] What could you say about so-called deliveries of Soviet military equipment to Iraq at present?

[Bannikov] As far as I know, our country complies unconditionally with all resolutions of the UN Security Council. The talk of deliveries is nothing but fantasy.

[Doronin] What is your assessment of the combat and technical status of the Iraqi Armed Forces?

[Bannikov] I cannot answer this question. We did not make such assessments because we accomplished limited tasks associated only with servicing materiel and weapons.

[Doronin] Here is one more thing which Anatoliy Vasilyevich said regarding the work of journalists:

[Bannikov] When I was still in Baghdad I did not get to meet many newspapermen. Nonetheless, they frequently wrote mind-boggling things allegedly attributable to me.

Expert on U.S. Views Gulf's Political Prospects

AU3001152591 Budapest *NEPSZABADSAG*
in Hungarian 28 Jan 91 p 4

[Interview with Viktor Kremenjuk, deputy director of the United States of America and Canada Institute in Moscow, by Peter Dunai in Moscow; date not given: "Someone Has To Mediate"]

[Excerpts] Our correspondent in Moscow asked Viktor Kremenjuk about the Gulf war, its possible consequences, and Soviet policy in the Middle East.

[Dunai] Many people think that the Iraqi conflict is a test for Moscow, namely whether Moscow sticks to its new foreign policy and whether the Soviet Union gives up its superpower position and accepts the role of second fiddle.

[Kremenjuk] The question is logical. It is a fact that the Soviet Union decided to reduce its confrontation with the United States and also to reduce its own military potential. We must remain a simple big power, and not a superpower. We cannot bear the obligations of a superpower economically. As for Iraq's role as a test, we indeed revised our Gromyko-type foreign policy. We then lived through a series of smaller crises: First, the changes in Eastern Europe; thank God, we stood the test and did not use the Brezhnev-doctrine. The reunification of Germany was another similar serious test for us. We also stood this test. Now, it is the Persian Gulf... We have also stood this test, albeit with difficulty. [passage omitted]

[Dunai] In your view, what will the Soviet relations be like with its allies in the area, Syria, Libya, and the PLO, after the war?

[Kremenyuk] Some changes will have to occur. You know, the Iraqi crisis has clarified a lot of things in the Soviet foreign policy and it has also cast a light in the darkest corners. The lesson is clear. We must stop basing policy on a confrontation in the Middle East. It is desirable to actively participate in solving the problem. We must "demilitarize" our policy, namely, our policy should not be based on allies we made through arms supplies. We must develop contacts with Israel and coordinate our policy with the Americans, Western Europeans, other countries interested in the area, and with the United Nations. If the Soviet line does not change.

[Dunai] Do you mean that there is a danger of change in the current Soviet foreign policy?

[Kremenyuk] Although Gorbachev said the opposite recently (namely that Soviet domestic and foreign policy will not change), such a danger definitely exists. Events make people wonder: the Baltics and the uncertainty about the planned summit in February (including doubts as regards the strategic arms limitation talks.) Shevardnadze's departure has increased this uncertainty because the personal factor is not something to be dismissed lightly. Pressure is increasing on the part of the conservatives and the military. [passage omitted]

[Dunai] Jewish World Congress President Edgar Bronfman met with Gorbachev in Moscow recently. According to Bronfman, the time is ripe for a new Middle East conference because, this time, the Soviet Union and the United States are on the same side. In your opinion, is there any chance for a new initiative?

[Kremenyuk] Definitely. We must also consider the Palestinian question, however. (By taking sides with Iraq), the PLO lost its relations with the world. The question is who should represent the Palestinians? In the past, the Soviet Union supported 'Arafat. Now, we have doubts. 'Arafat allows himself to make anti-Soviet declarations. Besides, why should we only look at things from 'Arafat's viewpoint? There are other Palestinian politicians and organizations.... [passage omitted]

[Dunai] Will the Soviet Union continue to be absent from the battle field?

[Kremenyuk] You know, Iraq was our ally and we supplied Iraq with weapons for a long time. The Soviet Union actively supports the UN resolutions, but someone has to stay away from the conflict in order to mediate. In a week, the demand might emerge to stop the war. But how? The Soviet Union is on good terms with Saddam, and also with the West.... Saddam has survived the air attacks, and he could also put up resistance in a land war for a long time. A stalemate could emerge. Who is capable of initiating a solution? Perhaps the United Nations.... But the unsuccessful attempts to mediate by the UN secretary general must warn us. Perhaps the Pope in Rome? The Pope could do it if Christians were at war. He has no authority in the Islamic world, however.... Time is also urgent. Oil is burning, and this

can have very dangerous ecological consequences. There is a risk of escalation in the conflict and of a new front opening from Turkey. The most dangerous scenario is that Israel does not hold back and retaliates....

[Dunai] Let us consider the economic aspect. Does the Soviet Union benefit from the fluctuations in the oil prices?

[Kremenyuk] So far, the Americans have succeeded in keeping oil prices relatively low. If fighting continues, however, oil prices will go up. The Soviet Union might benefit from this. Production is decreasing in the Soviet Union, however. In addition, we also lost the Iraqi oil which we partly sold to a third party. In order to compensate for this loss, we should increase domestic production. A few months ago, we thought an oil price increase would help us out. It has now become apparent that this was not a realistic expectation.

Israeli Official Queried on Retaliation

91UF0395A Moscow TRUD in Russian 29 Jan 91 p 3

[Article by TRUD correspondent Z. Nalbandyan: "In the Persian Gulf—Will There Be an Israeli Response?"]

[Text] Cairo, 28 January—To the naked eye it is apparent that it is costing the United States incredible effort to restrain Israel from conducting a responsive strike against Iraq. After every instance of an Iraqi SCUD landing in Israeli territory, President G. Bush phones Prime Minister Y. Shamir to express his sympathy.

Quite recently Jordan's King Husayn declared, for his part, that his country will not tolerate violations of its airspace by anyone, whoever it might be. The Americans have interpreted this as a warning to Israel.

Meanwhile, the Middle Eastern press is actively discussing the question—what kind of responsive strike could Israel inflict against Iraq? I called Tel Aviv to find out the view of the Israelis themselves. This is what I. Qeysar, an influential political figure of the country and general secretary of Israel's General Federation of Labor, told me:

"Of course, the continuing missile bombardments are creating a painful impression. It is particularly alarming that the strikes are targeted against the civilian population. All the missiles launched against Israel thus far have been aimed at densely populated cities of the country. It is among the peaceful civilian population that today we have fatalities and several hundred wounded. I must say, however, that the Israeli population is conducting itself quite courageously. There is no feeling of panic or anger. People understand the political situation fairly well and are not demanding immediate acts of vengeance from the country's leadership. The government is conducting itself quite carefully as well."

Two Belorussian girls from the Chernobyl zone are undergoing treatment at one of the hospitals where they are now sending the wounded. They have been there since the end of November. I phoned the hospital and asked T.I. Kosarezova, the Soviet doctor accompanying them, how they were enduring the missile bombardments.

"Like all the other patients. When the alarm sounds they go to specially equipped spaces and put on gas masks. They have already become accustomed to it...."

Assessments on Gulf War, Consequences Noted

Iran's Neutrality Questioned

PM3101151391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
30 Jan 91 Union Edition p 3

[Report by IAN correspondent S. Tatarinov: "Iran Maintains Neutrality"]

[Text] Tehran—"We will not shed blood for either American or Iraqi interests." In this short phrase, President Hashemi-Rafsanjani has, in my opinion, illustrated to the fullest degree Iran's attitude toward the war in the Persian Gulf, which is regarded here as nothing more than a war for oil. Neutrality is the principle governing Iran's position.

Today, however, neutrality for Tehran is not just a matter of not taking sides in a bitter quarrel. It is very difficult to observe from the wings when the inhabitants of Iran's border settlements have front row seats to watch the waves of multinational force bombers pound neighboring Iraqi cities every fifteen minutes. The smoke from the smoldering ruins of war, oblivious to borders, is hovering over Iran as well.

The feeling in Tehran is that neither combatant is fighting for a just cause. One seeks to retain what is not rightfully his. The other, under the guise of fulfilling the will of the international community, seeks not merely to punish the aggressor but also to consolidate his presence in this strategic region of the world. At a Friday prayer meeting, Hashemi-Rafsanjani stressed that the United States is striving to ensure that nobody else controls the fate of oil in the Persian Gulf.

In Tehran it is believed that the Nonaligned Movement and the Islamic Conference Organization should be more active in seeking roads to conciliation, and Iran has called on the latter to convene an extraordinary session.

A five-point draft settlement plan, submitted by the speaker of the Iranian legislature, has also been proposed. The plan envisages in particular an immediate cease-fire on the ground, in the air, and on the seas, and the simultaneous withdrawal of Iraqi troops from Kuwait and the multinational forces from the Persian Gulf region, installing in their place a peacekeeping contingent from Islamic countries. Baghdad's approach attempting to link its withdrawal from Kuwait with the

Palestinian problem arouses suspicion in Tehran. Here it is noted with full justification that the history of the Palestinian people's tragedy goes back much further and can hardly be cited as the reason for Iraq's invasion of Kuwait.

At the same time, Tehran deems any alteration of the region's political geography unacceptable and opposes plans for dismembering Iraq. Any attempts to do this run counter to the spirit of the UN Security Council resolution on Kuwait. As does the concentrated bombing of residential areas by the multinational air forces, which is sharply condemned by the Iranian population. The Iranian Red Crescent, for its part, has announced that humanitarian aid has been dispatched to the peaceful population of Iraq.

It seems that Iranians fear that both parties would like to draw them into the war. This would alter the situation immediately. The intention in Tehran is to remain neutral. Even an Israeli attack on Iraq is unlikely to weaken Iran's resolve. It is clear that in Baghdad they want to promote the current conflict as a "jihad," that is, a holy war between Muslims and infidels. Iraq is trying to recreate the situation when in past conflicts it was the alleged defender of all Arab interests. Ayatollah Khomeini, Iran's spiritual leader, rejected the possibility of a "jihad" and stressed that only Iran's neutrality corresponds to the spirit of Islam in this unjust war.

Of course, other views can be heard in Iran, right up to the demand to oppose the United States and its allies as a united front. The country's leadership has reacted calmly to such appeals from religious authorities and newspapers. It has merely asked Iranian television and radio, as a state-run organization, to follow the government's official line, but the others can write and speak as they think, as this is their right. Journalists are using this right, warning, for example, that Turkey "has been dangerously drawn into the war on the side of the United States."

The flight of Iraqi military aircraft into Iran has aroused particular interest around the world. Tehran officially confirmed that 26 January seven military aircraft from the Iraqi Air Force requested permission for a forced landing. They were met in the air by Iranian interceptors and escorted to an airfield. While landing, one Iraqi aircraft was involved in an accident and burst into flames, and two others were damaged. A representative from the Supreme National Security Council has announced that any aircraft belonging to either side which is forced to land on Iraqi territory will be detained until hostilities cease.

It is known from unofficial conversations that Iraqi civilian airliners landed in Iran and a number of other countries before hostilities erupted in the Persian Gulf. This fact has not been confirmed by the local media, however. [Tatarinov ends]

[Unattributed final paragraph] According to the Pentagon, approximately 100 Iraqi aircraft have flown to Iran.

Iraqi Terrorist Threat Viewed

*LD3101155291 Moscow Domestic Service
in Russian 1349 GMT 31 Jan 91*

[Text] [Podolnaya] Lidiya Podolnaya, the presenter of the international section of the panorama program and Igor Petrovich Belyayev, political observer of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA are at the microphone. As you know, we are going to talk about events in the Persian Gulf. There are a lot of articles in the foreign press these days, and in our own press, too, about the reasons which led to this war—some are more important, some less important, but it seems to me that the subject of terrorism occupies a special place here. What do you think, Igor Petrovich?

[Belyayev] I think that you are very close to the truth. On 2 April 1990 Iraqi President Saddam Husayn issued a quite definite threat against Israel. Quite simply, he threatened to flood half of Israel with weapons of mass destruction, chemical weapons, and that was practically the first sign, so to speak, of the fact that the Iraqi dictator had decided to use terror as one of his trump cards in achieving his political and military goals.

War in the Persian Gulf region is now in full swing—it is dragging out, it has already been in progress for almost two weeks and this means in practice that a lightning victory has not been achieved—and Iraq is even snapping out, seizing a Saudi town from which it is being driven out by American troops. But Saddam Husayn does not forget to remind us that he still has some secret weapons and the first type of secret weapon was ecological terror. That oil slick is just the first sign that ecological terror is being used against the anti-Iraqi coalition. I mean to say that yet to come are explosions at the Kuwait oil works which will cause a great deal of harm from which we ourselves could also suffer. We could indeed be burned by the blaze that will begin there.

The second type of secret weapon are the chemical weapons which Saddam Husayn could also use as his very last chance, as he has repeated on more than one occasion in recent days. Finally, there is one more type of terrorism which could affect too many people. I am thinking about the carrying out of a whole series of acts of terrorism throughout all the world's capitals. When I have said on earlier occasions when talking about the problems of terrorism that actions of that kind might pass us by, so to speak, today, unfortunately, I have to note some very, very worrying circumstances: I think that this time Moscow will not be an exception and I would therefore like to warn my fellow countrymen—I have in mind not just Moscow, but it could be other cities in the Soviet Union, too, where explosions or firing of some kind could be carried out. What form it could take is not clear, quite honestly it is not very clear to me yet who will carry out all this. The fact is that Saddam

Husayn has ordered all those people who carry out these acts of terrorism he plans to lay low, as they say.

It cannot be ruled out that they will receive the order to start to act in the very near future and it is not for nothing that the situation has been extremely tense in Paris and in some other West European capitals in recent days—a tension linked with the expectation of these terrorist actions which will be perpetrated by the agents of Saddam Husayn. I think that if today one talks about certain rules for the conduct of war, then these are being violated by Iraq in an unceremonious fashion: I am thinking about the Geneva convention, I am thinking about the capture of airmen and their use as a kind of shield during attacks by the Iraqi Army upon the positions of the Army of the anti-Iraqi coalition, I am also thinking about the whole series of terrorist actions that has been conceived in Baghdad. There are quite a lot of people prepared to carry them out and we could be faced with faits accomplis in the very near future.

[Podolnaya] No doubt we have given our listeners quite a fright, but nevertheless there are grounds for these forecasts. What can one put up against this in the present situation? What possibility do you see of halting the aggressor?

[Belyayev] First and foremost, of course, it is a question of the war being won by those who started it. For example, I consider that for the first time in history we are all witnessing a kind of historical paradox whereby peace is being established through war. I do not, however, see any other means of establishing peace in the Persian Gulf region now, for indeed how do you deal with the Iraqi dictator if he has such vast plans linked with the deepening of the military and political situation in the Persian Gulf region which can only be fought by military means?

Although, as you know, the Soviet Union is making the greatest possible efforts and furthermore following the visit to Washington by USSR Foreign Minister Bessmertnykh, a joint Soviet-U.S. statement has even been signed there saying that joint Soviet-U.S. steps could be taken aimed at a political settlement of this entire crisis on one condition: that Saddam Husayn leaves Kuwait—and the main objective, so to speak, of the war will be achieved.

[Podolnaya] Thank you, Igor Petrovich.

Damage Seen as Troubling

*PM3101153191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
31 Jan 91 Second Edition p 4*

["My Opinion" by Gennadiy Vasilyev: "So That the Sea Does Not Blaze"]

[Text] My childhood memories of the amusing poem about the blazing sea and the white whale calling for fire fighters' aid are unexpectedly becoming ominously real. Oil refineries in Iraq and Kuwait are ablaze, filling the

sky with black clouds, and a huge oil slick, 700 square miles in area, is spreading across the surface of the Gulf waters, disturbing viewers with pathetic scenes of dying birds and marine wildlife. Environmental catastrophe—the specter of the future—is becoming a real danger today. Some scientists even think that if this continues a “nuclear winter”—a sharp drop in temperature on our planet—may set in without the use of the highly destructive weapons.

Events on Iraqi territory, which is being showered with bombs and missiles day in day out, do not seem to count. It is as if there are no people there. Official figures for aircraft sorties (there have been 25,000), tonnage of explosives dropped (on the first day 1.5 times more than the explosive force of the atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima), and the colorful picture of the “technological war” are something like the cartoons portraying the struggle between “good” and “evil” that American children watch on television every day.

I remembered the ironic introduction used in years gone by: “We will fight for peace so that nothing is left standing.” No, I am not against the aggressor being punished and Kuwait’s independence being restored. I am in favor of the UN Security Council’s resolutions on this subject—decisions that express the will of most of the international community. But I think that it is necessary to ensure that the means match the ends. Or else what will remain after the victory of “good”—scorched earth, bombed cities, the total collapse of the country’s economy? How many lives will be sacrificed on the altar of victory—Iraqi, Kuwaiti, and American lives, the lives of everyone involved in the cycle of death? Especially since military observers explain that the main push is still ahead. After another few weeks of massive bombings the multinational forces will switch to offensive operations and thousands of tanks and hundreds of thousands of soldiers will move into action in the desert. Of course, the losses will rise.

I am not the only one troubled by these matters. People in many countries are now thinking in alarm that the Gulf war is dragging on and expanding and that events are threatening to get out of control. There are plenty of commentators who think that the actions of the multinational forces led by the United States may go beyond the aims outlined in the well-known UN Security Council Resolution No. 678, or have already done so. France’s *LE MONDE*, for instance, thinks that the aims which the anti-Saddam coalition is currently pursuing are not only to secure Iraq’s speediest withdrawal from Kuwait, but also to “wipe out Iraq altogether as a threatening regional power.” The newspaper writes that these tasks go far beyond the official aims proclaimed at the beginning of Operation “Desert Storm” and set out in the UN resolutions. Britain’s conservative *DAILY TELEGRAPH* voices the suspicion that the U.S. military’s statements as regards the need to further “indoc-trinate” Iraq using bomber aviation “conceal a desire to secure the total destruction of Iraq from the air.”

That is what some Western observers think. I did, of course, take notice of U.S. President G. Bush’s statement that people in the United States do not want to destroy Iraq and that they respect the Iraqi people. I would like to believe that this is really the case. But war has its logic and, bending to this logic, the war is increasingly generating an orgy of blood and destruction.

Military operations in the Persian Gulf have been under way for two weeks now. On the one hand, there is the incessant massive bombings, the fantastic amount of explosives dropped on enemy territory, and the state-of-the-art weapons. While, on the other, there is a large military machine, still operational despite these strikes, accompanied by a stubborn refusal to heed the calls of the international community, and Baghdad’s threats of using “mass-destruction weapons.” The end of the war is not in sight. Events are tending to escalate. Even the forces of reason have suffered a defeat amid the six months’ dispute, diplomats have fallen silent, and the guns have begun to fire. But if the two weeks of war have proved anything it is that the potential of force is limited. Limited as an acceptable means of asserting international law and justice. But unlimited in terms of the irreparable damage inflicted on all living things, on all peoples’ possessions, and on everything for which generations have worked. Hard as it may be, it is necessary to step up the quest for political means of resolving the conflict. In order to ensure that the sea of human destruction does not spread further.

Allied, Iraqi Ground Reserves Eyed

91UM0322A Moscow TRUD in Russian 29 Jan 91 p 3

[Article by Major General A. Ivanov: “The Opinion of a Military Specialist”]

[Text] The most acute and disturbing event in the Gulf area in recent days was the formation of a huge oil slick as a result of the entry of a large quantity of oil from the area of al-Kuwayt into the Persian Gulf (according to reports, up to 12 million liters enters the Gulf daily). It is clear that this ecological catastrophe was caused by the war. Both belligerents are blaming each other for what happened. Apparently, it will not be possible to ascertain the culprit soon.

As for Iraq, it seems that it is still biding its time, trying to conserve the strike forces of its ground troops and aviation for a period of decisive operations, eliminate the aftereffects of air-missile strikes on its territory, and restore to a maximum degree the functioning of the air defense system, and also the system of state and military command and control.

It can be said that although only 13 days have passed since its start, the war has come close to that point when some kind of new decisions are required of the leaders of the belligerents. As has already been emphasized in our previous reviews, determination of the moment to

commit ground troops has become one of the most important questions for the command authorities of the multinational forces.

According to all of the canons of military art, the attacking side, that is the multinational forces, needs at least a three times superiority in forces and means for a successful resolution of the task of routing the Iraqi group in Kuwait and in the south of Iraq. But in reality, the groupings of the sides opposing each other on the Kuwait axis are approximately equal. The Iraqi command has large reserves available to it, however, while the command of the multinational forces has not yet established such reserves. Even taking into account the more advanced weapons of the troops of the anti-Iraq coalition, it is hardly likely that the military-political leadership of the United States and the countries allied with it will decide to risk their divisions by hurling them against Iraq without their additional careful preparation and, possibly, reinforcement with new contingents.

One can only guess about the dates of the possible commitment of ground troops of the multinational forces under such conditions, although the necessity for this is obvious.

Prospects for Ground Offensive Seen

91UM0322B Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
29 Jan 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report by A. Ostalskiy, IZVESTIYA special correspondent: "Kuwait Turned into Mine Field"]

[Text] Abu Dhabi—The inhabitants of the states of the Persian Gulf heaved a sigh of relief Monday morning when they learned that the discharge of oil into the sea waters of the northern part of the Gulf was discontinued.

A representative of the Abu Dhabi administration of water supply and electric power reported that desalination plants will be protected from the oil by special barriers and other methods. The United Arab Emirates also hope to receive help from Western countries in the near future.

There is one more piece of news which was given particular attention by the local press of the United Arab Emirates—a report on the additional mobilization into the Army of "reservist-volunteers." Fifty percent of state employees who have military training were urgently called up into the Armed Forces, and also all other categories, with the exception of students. As is supposed here, this measure was taken in connection with preparation for an offensive by the multinational forces for the purpose of dislodging Iraqi troops from Kuwait, which is fraught with the complications of the situation and also with the threat of terrorist acts.

There is no doubt whatever that a ground offensive cannot be avoided. It is surmised that such an offensive will begin in the near future—apparently, in the first half of February. This is indicated also by the movement of

allied troops that are advancing closer and closer to the border between Saudi Arabia and Kuwait.

A difficult task faces the multinational forces—the Iraqi positions are well fortified. In addition, the Iraqi troops have densely mined all routes to Kuwait. The mine fields run along the border in two belts.

In short, the war is continuing and, what is more, it is entering a new and even more dangerous phase. Can this development of events be averted?

M. Karrubi, the chairman of the Iranian legislature, believes that it can. At least, he came out Sunday with a new peace plan. Its gist: Iraq withdraws its troops from Kuwait, and the multinational forces—from the area of the Persian Gulf.

This plan, however, was received with skepticism in the Arab states of the Persian Gulf. The local newspapers emphasize its unreality. "Any peace plan must be addressed to Saddam Husayn, because only he can stop the war, by making a decision to withdraw his troops from Kuwait—this is the most minimal condition that is necessary to establish peace," the KHALEEF TIMES wrote Monday.

IZVESTIYA Reports Iraqi Aircraft in Iran

91UM0322C Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
28 Jan 91 Union Edition p 4

[IZVESTIYA Press Service Report: "Iraqi Aircraft in Iran"]

[Text] According to the latest reports on combat operations, by Sunday Iraq had lost 22 aircraft in air battles, and 23 had been destroyed on the ground. The allied command reports that the multinational forces lost 24 aircraft and helicopters; Baghdad gives another figure—192.

On Saturday, Iraq conducted the sixth salvo in succession of "Scud" missiles against Israel, and the fifth salvo against Saudi Arabia. The damage inflicted is not great. REUTERS reports that American officials admit that a majority of Iraq's 800 aircraft are intact and concealed in hangars scattered throughout various points of the country.

As for the appearance of Iraqi aircraft in Iran (according to some information there are eight, and according to other data there are 24), the objective of their flight is being ascertained. According to some statements, allied aircraft drove them into Iranian air space, and, according to others, this was a group desertion. One way or the other, Tehran has firmly promised to keep these aircraft in Iran until the end of the war.

UPI reports that the Egyptian legislature, by a convincing majority of votes, last Saturday approved the government's policy in the Persian Gulf. Iran once again affirmed that it will not negate its own position of neutrality in the conflict. V.C. Shukla, Indian minister of

external affairs, declared that the question of the war in the Persian Gulf will be discussed by the ministers of foreign affairs of the countries of the Nonaligned Movement in Belgrade in February. The same problem was discussed by Pakistani Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif in Cairo. He left there Saturday for Saudi Arabia, and the subsequent points on his trip are Iran, Turkey, Syria, and Jordan. Last Sunday, Egyptian Minister of Foreign Affairs 'Abd-al-Majid departed for the United States with a message on problems of the war in the Gulf for U.S. President G. Bush from Egyptian President H. Mubarak.

Massive demonstrations to stop the war are occurring in various countries. Such demonstrations in the United States were held in Washington (75,000 participants), in San Francisco (70,000), and in Los Angeles. More than 250,000 persons demonstrated in the German capital, and in Paris—about 10,000. Large demonstrations for peace took place this Saturday in Japan, Canada, and Mexico.

Afghan Envoy Discusses Regional Issues

*LD2501223791 Moscow TASS in English 1539 GMT
25 Jan 91*

[By TASS correspondent Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow January 25 TASS—"The policy of national reconciliation and contacts with field commanders and moderate opposition, launched by the Afghan Government four years ago, helped elaborate a plan for a peaceful settlement of the Afghan problem," Afghan Ambassador to Moscow Mohammad Daud Razmyar said at a news conference here today.

The plan envisages launching a dialogue between the warring parties, a ceasefire, setting up a coordinating committee to draft the country's new constitution, involving all parties concerned, and holding U.N.-monitored general direct elections.

Mohammad Daud Razmyar said that despite the Afghan Government's efforts, the extremist-minded opposition did not respond to Kabul's initiative and, moreover, did not present its proposals. In addition, the Peshawar Seven [party alliance] carries on hostilities on the country's territory, which is facilitated by Pakistan's interference in Afghanistan's internal affairs.

The ambassador expressed satisfaction with positive changes in China's stance on the Afghan issue and the development of Pakistan's relations with other countries in the region, including Iran, India and Turkey.

On relations with the USSR, Mohammad Daud Razmyar said that they were acquiring a mutually beneficial nature. He recalled the recent meeting with Russian President Boris Yeltsin, as a result of which agreement was reached to preserve the amount of gratis aid provided to Afghanistan by Russia.

The diplomat spoke about efforts taken by the Afghan government and security agencies to search for Soviet prisoners of war. Asked about how many of such POW's were in Afghanistan, the ambassador said that their number could range from 200 to 300, but neither the government nor the opposition had exact figures.

The ambassador dwelt in detail on his government's stance towards the Gulf crisis. He said, in part, that Afghanistan favoured an early ceasefire and the convocation of a conference of Islamic states, within the framework of which the problem needs to be solved.

In Mohammad Daud Razmyar's view, the world community used all means, including possible compromises, to end the war. He said the Afghan leadership discerned "signs of change in Saddam Husayn's position".

The Afghan diplomat also drew attention to the need to step up the United Nations' activity in settling the crisis, which has clearly abated since the beginning of combat operations in that region.

Political & Social

Gorbachev Opens Federation Council Meeting

LD0102102191 Moscow TASS in English 1008 GMT
1 Feb 91

[By TASS World Service correspondent Andrey Orlov]

[Text] Moscow February 1 TASS—This year's third session of the USSR Federation Council opened in the Kremlin today under the chairmanship of President Mikhail Gorbachev.

The session is being attended by top leaders and prime ministers of the Union republics. Lithuania is represented by its permanent envoy in Moscow.

When declaring the session open, Gorbachev did not rule out the possibility that the Federation Council's work would be continued on Saturday as well. There is a full agenda that includes discussing the preparation of a Union treaty, including the delineation of powers between the Union centre and Union republics, and the situation in the Baltics. The latter item, the president said, was raised by life itself.

The president also pointed out his intention to consider a third item that is likely to be discussed on Saturday. However, he did not specify this item.

CPSU Central, Control Committees Hold Plenum

Communique Issued

LD3102234791 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 2205 GMT 31 Jan 91

[Text] Moscow, 1 Feb (TASS)—A joint plenum of the Central Committee and Central Control Commission of the CPSU was held on 31 January 1991.

The following questions were presented for examination by the plenum:

1. The current situation.
2. The preparations for the registration of the rules of the CPSU.
3. Documents setting out the principles and methods of the CPSU and the organizational and political strengthening of party organisations.
4. The budget of communist parties of union republics for the year 1991.
5. Organizational questions.

The plenum was opened by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

The plenum was attended by first secretaries of republican, kray, oblast, and okrug committees of the party, second secretaries of central committees, and chairman of control commissions of communist parties of union

republics not belonging to the central elected bodies of the CPSU, USSR people's deputies belonging to the CPSU, editors of party newspapers and journals, and representatives of the USSR Armed Forces and certain departments and organizations.

A report on the first item on the agenda was delivered by V.A. Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Taking part in the debates were: Yu.A. Prokofyev, first secretary of the Moscow City Party Committee; P.A. Zhiganov, electrical mechanic of the "Tsentralnaya" colliery of the town of Partizansk, Maritime Kray; A.A. Pomorov, first secretary of the Tomsk Party Oblast Committee; V.V. Grigoryev, first secretary of the Vitebsk Oblast Committee of the Belorussian Communist Party; I.K. Polozkov, first secretary of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Communist Party Central Committee; V.A. Antonov, secretary of the Party Committee of the Vilnius scientific research institute of radio measuring devices, Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]; S.I. Gurenko, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party; R. Atadzhanov, chairman of the Lenin Collective Farm, Uzbek SSR; Ye.N. Makhov, first deputy chairman of the Central Control Commission of the CPSU; Ye.N. Chernyshov, first secretary of the Perm Oblst Party Committee; Ye.M. Kalinina, secretary of the Leningrad Oblast Party Committee; P.M. Melnikov, secretary of the Party Committee of the "Karagandaugol" 50th anniversary of the October revolution colliery production association, Kazakhstan SSR; M.G. Aliyev, first secretary of the Dagestan Republic Party Committee; B.I. Oleynik, deputy chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet; Yu.V. Lavrenov, driver of the Moscow-3 locomotive depot of the Moscow railway, Moscow City; G.N. Seleznev, chief editor of UCHITELSKAYA GAZETA; V.F. Rymashevskiy, second secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee; A.A. Malofeyev, first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee; G.P. Kazmin, first secretary of the Krasnoyarsk Party Kray Committee; N.A. Moiseyev, member of the Military Council, head of the Political Directorate of Ground Forces; M.M. Burokevicius, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee; A.A. Bessmertnykh, USSR foreign minister; V.S. Kulikov, milling machine operator of the Nizhniy Novgorod S. Ordzhonikidze aviation production association; V.S. Malkovskiy, second secretary of the Estonian Communist Party (CPSU) Central Committee; and K.Y. Komissarov, head of faculty at Tallinn State Conservatory, Estonian SSR.

Editorial commissions for the preparation of plenum documents were formed.

A.S. Dzasokhov, CPSU Central Committee secretary, spoke from the editorial commission on the first question.

After a comprehensive study of the proposals and remarks received, and the ensuing discussion, a political declaration "On the Current Situation and Party Tasks" was adopted. It will be published in the press.

O.S. Shenin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, gave a report "On the Registration of the Rules of the CPSU" and "On the CPSU Normative-Procedural Documents and the Organizational-Political Reinforcement of Party Organizations." The plenum also heard a report "On the 1991 Budget of Communist Parties of Union Republics" from N.Ye. Kruchina, CPSU Central Committee administrator of affairs.

Yu.A. Manaenkov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, spoke on behalf of the drafting commission.

After discussion, the plenum adopted the decisions "On Preparations for the Registration of the CPSU Rules", "On the Organizational-Political Reinforcement of Party Organizations," and "On the 1991 Budget of Communist Parties of Union Republics," and it confirmed the following instructions: On the procedure for elections to the CPSU and recall from elective bodies; on the registration of CPSU members and on party statistics; on record-keeping in the CPSU organizations and elective bodies; about recording Party membership fees and the financial-economic activity of CPSU organizations; on the work of CPSU organizations in the USSR armed forces; and also the following regulations: On the status of secretaries of the primary party organizations of the CPSU; on "CPSU veterans" and on holding discussions and referendums within the CPSU.

The plenum adopted a decision to form a commission of members of the CPSU Central Committee and the Central Control Commission to be sent to study the state of affairs in the Estonian party organization, bearing in mind the search for ways to consolidate the communists' forces, and the preservation of civil peace and public accord in the republic.

The plenum removed A.I. Gelman from CPSU Central Committee membership due to his losing ties with the party and released G.G. Gumbaridze from his duties as the member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo in connection with the discontinuation of his activities as first secretary of the Central Committee of the Georgian Communist Party.

The CPSU Central Committee Plenum expresses its disagreement with the latest statements made in the press by Academician S.S. Shatalin, member of the Central Committee, and considers the views expressed in them as being incompatible with membership of the CPSU and, moreover, its Central Committee.

The plenum will instruct the CPSU Central Control Commission Presidium to consider, after his recovery, the actions by Comrade S.S. Shatalin, and to submit proposals for consideration by the next CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

In connection with the election of Comrade G.I. Yanayev as the USSR vice president, and the need for him to focus his efforts on work in this post, he has been released from the duties of Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee secretary.

The plenum elected Comrade L.E. Annus, who is first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party (CPSU) Central Committee, as member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo.

Comrade P.K. Luchinskiy was elected secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The plenum then concluded its work.

Plenum Adopts Political Statement

*LD3101192491 Moscow TASS in English 1920 GMT
31 Jan 91*

[By TASS correspondent Boris Zverev and Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow January 31 TASS—"What the country needs most of all today is civic peace and national accord," says a political statement adopted by the plenary meeting of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee that opened here today.

The statement sums up discussion on the first item on the plenum's agenda—the party's current tasks.

Aleksandr Dzasokhov, a Politburo member and Central Committee secretary of the party, acquainted journalists with the content of this statement at a press conference at the party Press Centre today.

He emphasised that in the statement the plenum called for immediately restoring constitutional order in the country on the basis of the decisions of the Fourth Soviet Congress of People's Deputies. The document appeals to the USSR Supreme Soviet, republican parliaments and all people's deputies of the country to forge constructive interactions to the point of holding joint meetings of presidiums and sessions.

According to Dzasokhov, it is unclear for the present whether the plenum will end today or continue its work.

Overview of Plenum

*LD3101193991 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1904 GMT 31 Jan 91*

[By TASS correspondents Boris Zverev and Vladimir Isachenkov: "CPSU Central Committee Plenum Adopts Political Declaration"]

[Text] Moscow, 31 January (TASS)—The plenum of the CPSU Central Committee opening in Moscow today has called for the immediate restoration of constitutional order in the country, on the basis of the decisions of the Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

A political declaration adopted by the plenum, after the debate on the current situation and the party's tasks, expresses support for the assertion of sovereignty by union and autonomous republics. At the same time it notes that the practice of certain republics in ignoring decisions taken by congresses of USSR people's deputies, and the unlawful revocation of clauses in the country's constitution, have opened the way to lawlessness and made possible the adoption of anti-democratic and unconstitutional acts encroaching on individual rights. This naturally gives rise to protest and even provokes people to resist these acts.

Aleksandr Dzasokhov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, acquainted journalists with the content of the political declaration this evening. He said that the participants in the plenum expressed their grief at the death of people as a result of the tragic events in the Baltic republics and in the Transcaucasus, and that they confirmed their determination to do everything possible to halt the fratricidal killing and to bring the country back on the path of construction.

The Central Committee secretary also said that the participants in the plenum confirmed the need to implement a consistent policy of developing a market economy.

Aleksandr Dzasokhov disclosed that today's discussions at the plenum touched on the situation in the Persian Gulf area. The speakers included Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh. The plenum called on the country's state leadership to undertake the steps needed, before the international community and the UN, to bring an end to the hostilities.

According to Aleksandr Dzasokhov, it is not clear at the moment whether the plenum will end today or whether it will continue its work tomorrow.

Answering questions from journalists, Aleksandr Dzasokhov denied rumors about the preparation of a package of decisions which would impose a moratorium on the activities of all political parties, except the CPSU, and suspend the press law. These rumors are "purest fiction," the CPSU Central Committee secretary stressed.

He also said that the report on the present situation, which had been presented by Vladimir Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the Central Committee, paid considerable attention to economic problems. The participants in the plenum consider, in particular, that the amendment of prices must be accompanied by indexation of the cost of living, and compensation for price increases.

Asked why commanders of military districts are taking part in the plenum, Aleksandr Dzasokhov explained that it has been the tradition for many years to invite important military chiefs to attend plenums.

The Central Committee secretary told journalists that, by the beginning of the news conference, the plenum had examined only the first question on its agenda. He said that it is scheduled to discuss the budget of communist parties of union republics, and also certain other documents pertaining to CPSU activities.

Silayev Says Price Rise Decree To Be Issued

*AU0102113091 Paris AFP in English 1106 GMT
1 Feb 91*

[Text] Moscow, Feb 1 (AFP)—Prices hikes will be introduced throughout the Soviet Union under a presidential decree, Russian Prime Minister Ivan Silayev told the Russian parliament Friday [1 February].

Saying that price rises had already been prepared by Soviet authorities, Mr. Silayev said that "this reform will take effect nationwide and be introduced in a presidential decree throughout the country at the same time".

Price rises were on the agenda of Friday's session of the Federation Council, the top state leadership grouping the presidents of all Soviet republics.

However, the State Prices Committee has denied that prices would more than double as of Friday.

Mr. Silayev said that "all responsibility lies with the Soviet government" concerning any price hikes.

He said the Russian government planned to index price rises to wages, but did not give details.

Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev has issued a series of decrees in the last two weeks, notably ordering joint Army and police patrols into the streets of major cities as of Friday, and giving the KGB secret police the power to search business premises in a bid to stamp out "economic sabotage".

Presidium Seeks IZVESTIYA Editor's Dismissal

*LD3001120191 Moscow Radio Rossii Network
in Russian 1100 GMT 30 Jan 91*

[Text] Reliable sources in the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium have said, in a telephone poll of its members, that a decision is now being voted on about releasing Igor Golembiovskiy, first deputy chief editor of the IZVESTIYA newspaper, from his duties. The situation is a complete surprise for Ivan Laptev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the Union, who represents the interests of the IZVESTIYA newspaper in the USSR Supreme Soviet, being, until recently, its editor in chief. In connection with what has happened, the IZVESTIYA editorial collective is urgently being gathered. The democratic and independent course of IZVESTIYA, which has won immense prestige and popularity in society, is linked with the name of such leaders of the newspaper as Igor Golembiovskiy. Evidently this does not suit the leadership of the USSR Supreme Soviet. In this connection, it is relevant to recall the last

day of the fourth session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, when the president made a proposal on suspending the law on the press, which was not supported by deputies. The political decisions of the last few days are acquiring a dangerous logic.

Workers Oppose Removal

*LD3101150691 Moscow Domestic Service
in Russian 1230 GMT 31 Jan 91*

[Text] The events taking place at the editorial office of the IZVESTIYA newspaper have developed further. A working meeting of employees of the IZVESTIYA newspaper and the SOYUZ and NEDELYA weekly editions ended very late last night [30 January]. It decided unanimously that removing Igor Golembiovskiy from his post of first deputy editor-in-chief without his consent is absolutely unacceptable for the IZVESTIYA workers. It also contradicts the interests of perestroyka. The meeting said that the decision should be cancelled and stressed that Igor Golembiovskiy enjoys the well-deserved confidence of the employees.

As we have already reported a decision to release Igor Golembiovskiy was voted on by means of a telephone poll of members of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. The members were told that Golembiovskiy allegedly agreed to leave his post of first deputy editor-in-chief and go to Spain as a newspaper correspondent. It became clear at the meeting that this was not true. Golembiovskiy refused to resign and immediately told the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet about this. The meeting demanded an urgent meeting of the editorial collective with Anatoliy Lukyanov, leaders of the republican parliament, and the chairman of the Committee for Glasnost. It was decided to inform President Gorbachev and the leadership of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the meeting's decision. The IZVESTIYA employees decided that if the meeting's decision is ignored they will reserve the right to strive for their demands within the framework of existing legislation.

The meeting also suggested that its decision should be published in today's edition of IZVESTIYA. However, as we found out, Nikolay Yefimov, its editor-in-chief, did not allow this to take place. Incidentally, much effort had to be made in order to make the editor-in-chief at least read a letter written by Ivan Laptev, chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet, to the IZVESTIYA collective. Until recently, Laptev was the newspaper's editor-in-chief. Regardless of the fact that it was an open letter not everything was read. But what was read allows me to judge Laptev's position. He is categorically against releasing Igor Golembiovskiy from the post of first deputy editor-in-chief of IZVESTIYA. He asks Yefimov, editor-in-chief, to assess correctly the political situation which is taking shape around the newspaper against the backdrop of the situation in the country and the general situation, and not to confront the collective.

Ivan Laptev expressed his concern that public opinion might link the decision on releasing Golembiovskiy with the President's recent remark regarding suspension of the law on the press, and by this the president's authority might be shaken. Laptev is also concerned with the fact that releasing Igor Golembiovskiy, one of the founders of the MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI newspaper, the views of which are well known and which is regularly criticized by Gorbachev, could also be seen as open persecution of the independent weekly edition by the president. Thank you for your attention. This is Aleksandr Tikhonov at the news desk of Russia's radio.

Major Jailed for 'Attempted Betrayal'

*LD3101135591 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1320 GMT 31 Jan 91*

[Text] Moscow, 31 Jan (TASS)—It is reported here today that on 28 January the Military Tribune of Moscow Military District completed the hearing of the case for the prosecution of Major Viktor Kutsenko, born 1955, scientific worker of the Scientific Research Institute of the USSR Ministry of Defense, for attempted betrayal of the motherland by handing over state and military secrets.

During the investigation and the legal examination Kutsenko acknowledged his guilt and showed that for selfish reasons he had tried to convey to representatives of the intelligence service of a NATO country, documentary materials that he had accessed in the course of his duty. The information contained in the said documents is state secret.

The thwarting of Kutsenko's criminal activity made it possible to prevent serious damage to the interests of the defense and state security of the USSR. The potential damage could have amounted to over R100 million.

By decision of the tribunal Viktor Kutsenko has been sentenced to 5 years' deprivation of liberty.

Economic

Economist Evaluates Bank Note Exchange

*914A0379A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
26 Jan 91 Union Edition p 1*

[Report on interview with V. Ivanter, doctor of economic sciences and deputy director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of National Economic Forecasting, by D. Khrapovitskiy; date and place not specified: "Money Exchange: A Tactic for the Day, or the Beginning of a Strategy?—Comments of a Specialist"]

[Text] IZVESTIYA has already written in detail about the progress of the bank note exchange. Would that we could succeed with only three days of general anxiety to

pay for the fight against speculation, corruption, smuggling, forgeries, and unearned profits! Has the new Cabinet of Ministers reasoned out everything both in strategy and in tactics?... This and other questions posed by IZVESTIYA are answered by V. Ivanter, doctor of economic sciences and deputy director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of National Economic Forecasting.

[Khrapovitskiy] Viktor Viktorovich, how do professional economists, practically speaking, evaluate the idea itself of the confiscatory exchange of large-denomination bank notes?

[Ivanter] Today, it is easiest of all to predict troubles. But we will not start with them. As a professional, I am compelled to do justice to the authors of the "weak" currency reform that has begun. It can be expected that it will bring about a definite reduction in the mass of notes in circulation that is feeding inflation owing to the resources of the mafia structure, to money that is illegally taken abroad, and so forth.

What will be the benefit of the measures being employed? At this moment I am compelled to speak hypothetically, since I am not familiar with what the cabinet intends to do. It is absolutely obvious that the weak reform that has begun, conducted by itself, and outside the context of other measures, will prove to be pointless. If they are not followed, then within a certain time the mass of currency will restore itself in pre-reform dimensions, and it will once again begin to whip up catastrophic trends in the economy. I hope that soon after the end of the exchange the Cabinet of Ministers will undertake a series of new steps to increase supplies for the consumer market, and, in particular, that it will transfer to market funds a substantial part of building materials that were used so inefficiently in production construction. Like the move to a market, this was talked about a long time ago. It is logical to expect that the governmental package has provided for a substantial increase of market funds of long-use commodities. It is also logical to expect the kind of conversion of defense industries in which enterprises producing civilian products will move entirely out of the defense sector. I suppose that the government fully understands the importance of such a followup measure as a reduction of export consumer commodities and their use in an almost empty domestic market.

[Khrapovitskiy] The devastation of the consumer market began after the Law on State Enterprises went into effect. Earnings then jumped sharply, but the level of production remained practically unchanged. A demand for everything broke out, and destabilization resulted. Can we expect that the situation will change?

[Ivanter] The booming demand "for everything" can be called the inflationary expectations of the population. The people, not seeing commodities on store shelves, and having a pile of money in their hands, expected a monetary reform and price increases, and they grabbed everything that was available. As we see, the feeling of

the people did not let them down. In our situation, we should expect the following step toward stabilization from the government: a change in the system of retail prices. And the already accomplished increase in bank interest should also begin to work. Not all of these measures were conducted systematically, but in the end one would like to hope that under the new conditions the new government will consistently follow the path that leads to an elimination of the booming demand.

[Khrapovitskiy] It appears that you have already set forth the positive expectations associated with the money exchange.

[Ivanter] The positive part that, I hope, the government will implement in the form of a complex of measures, and will really have an effect, let me put it this way, will have an ambiguous effect. We will start with the fact that distrust can also now begin to spread to 20-ruble notes. There is a danger here of hoarding at home; that is, an accumulation of small denomination notes, complicating commodity turnover.

It also should not be lost sight of that the restrictions that are being introduced on the issuance of cash money by the savings banks can reduce the growth of deposits at the expense of current profits. Then the population's cash on hand will increase, and, of course, its pressure on the consumer market will also increase. The government must also be ready for this, and a package of measures to stimulate savings is needed.

[Khrapovitskiy] In what way?

[Ivanter] If the government really wants to reduce the mass of bank notes, for which you have to vote with both hands, it apparently must civilize the system of noncash transfer accounts.

[Khrapovitskiy] Are you confident that all of these measures will be adopted after the exchange?

[Ivanter] I think that the financial consultants of the government are sufficiently competent. But I and other specialists still have some misgivings. Because our experience, unfortunately, shows that by far not all things are always apparent to the leadership, and that our native bureaucracy will carry on in its customary form.

Having finished with the economic part, I would also like to express my opinion with respect to the technical-organizational conduct of this "soft" monetary reform and the psychological factor associated with it, that is also very important in economics. And here it is difficult for me to be objective. My father, who is 86 years of age, stood in a line on 23 January at one of the post offices of Perovskiy Rayon in Moscow for an entire day. None of the 800 pensioners who were able to get there exchanged their notes. And I, a person who actively supports a deflationary policy, and a doctor of economic sciences, cannot explain to him the connection between this policy and the humiliating condition of our people, especially

our old people, at savings banks. Indeed, did the government prepare itself for this reform? While fighting against the mafia structure and their accumulations, why are we humiliating decent people? Where is the sense?

The trouble is in our administrative and general lack of culture, and, not having mastered it, we frequently will still end up in a bazaar instead of a market.

Economist on Problems of Ruble Exchange

914A0377A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY
in Russian No 4, Jan 91 pp 1, 4

[Interview with economist V. Selyunin by ARGUMENTY I FAKTY correspondent N. Zhelnorova; place and date not given: "Monetary Precipitation"]

[Text] Along with events in Baltia and the Persian Gulf, a new event has agitated the country—a partial monetary reform that, as the government had previously sworn, was unnecessary and that it was not preparing.

Our correspondent N. Zhelnorova talked to well-known economist V. Selyunin.

[Zhelnorova] What is your comment on the decree of the USSR president dated 22 January on exchanging large bills and freezing savings?

[Selyunin] There has been much talk of a monetary reform. It has proceeded in two ways. First, inflation, the growth of prices, has been eating away at our savings. The savings bank pays two or three percent interest, whereas inflation is many times higher. More than one-third of all the money that is in circulation is in 50- and 100-ruble [R] bills. The exchange will last only three days; this means that many people will be physically unable to exchange them.

[Zhelnorova] In your opinion, how much money may be lost?

[Selyunin] The entire stock of money in circulation as of the beginning of the year came to R136 billion. This means that the main segment of the R45 billion that is large bills will be confiscated. Poor people are not supposed to have large bills. However, this is not quite so. Quite the contrary, they try to keep large bills just in case, being aware of the indelicacy of our government with regard to other people's savings.

[Zhelnorova] May the current action be considered a monetary reform?

[Selyunin] Yes, this is a confiscatory measure. It will confiscate tens of billions of rubles.

[Zhelnorova] As you see it, is this measure wise under the circumstances?

[Selyunin] The government has no other way out but to confiscate—or implement a profound economic reform and let go of prices, make them free, abolish wage

restrictions, and switch to the prices of market equilibrium. The budget fails to regain balance because the government does not do this in any manner. The deficit of all budgets in the country amounts to between R200 and R250 billion, which it was calculated to be at the outset. By special tricks, V. Pavlov reduced this deficit to an acceptable number, but this is purely a bookkeeping exercise. Together with my coauthor, well-known economist G. Khanin, I believe that production will decline by approximately 15 percent in 1991, despite international economic organizations being convinced that a decline of a minimum five percent will occur. If production declines by this much (naturally, profits will drop still more), we will not patch up the holes in our budget.

According to Pavlov, production will not decline at all, or it will decline minimally, and there will even be an improvement on a number of indicators. Taxes on growing profits will amount to a considerable sum. Meanwhile, we see that there are no signs of improvement at all. This is quite comparable with what the United States experienced during "the Great Depression" of 1929-1932. The government is deluding itself by painting good budgetary revenues.

[Zhelnorova] Be that as it may, it is clear that some measures aimed at financial streamlining in our country are not only due but overdue. The people see no sense in working because of the abundance of money with which they cannot buy necessary goods. Our currency has become indecently depreciated. Recently, you said yourself that at present you get nothing for a ruble, and soon you will get a slap in the face. According to the data of sociologists, 60 percent of those polled are in favor of a monetary reform; more than 52 percent believe that in the two to three years to come inflation will not be stopped successfully.

[Selyunin] Noncash funds account for nine-tenths of the entire monetary circulation in our country. Cash funds account for merely one-tenth. Goods should be available for cash funds. We have taken a direct step from an administrative command system into that of irresponsible populism. We promised to raise retirement benefits, wages, and scholarships. Meanwhile, it turned out that there was no money in the coffers! In the first half of the 1980's, between R3 and R4 billion a year were printed additionally; in 1988, another R11.5 billion, and in 1989, R18 billion. In 1990, the addition of money to cash circulation amounted to no less than R25 billion rubles. According to my calculations, this year another R50 billion will have to be printed. There are no goods to cover this money; therefore, the savings that the people have accumulated need to be confiscated.

[Zhelnorova] A single piece of paper with the decree has turned tens of billions of rubles into worthless paper. Honest money that the people kept "for a rainy day" or could not spend to buy goods because goods were not for sale will also be sacrificed in the course of the reform.

Not everyone will be up to the task of proving to a commission that he is not a swindler. They should have said in the decree: "People, there is not going to be 'a rainy day,' give us your reserves." However, people would have hardly believed the president even if he had bet his head on it rather than just two hands, as Gerashchenko did.

Vasiliy Illarionovich, it would be interesting to know what, in your opinion, our new prime minister thinking was when he introduced this reform?

[Selyunin] There is a classical law of equilibrium. The total of cash funds in circulation (R136 billion in our case) multiplied by the number of turnovers per year (approximately five) should be equal to the entire array of goods and services multiplied by the prices of these goods and services. When the left part equals the right part, trade operates normally, money and goods are balanced, and finances are stable. When this equation is upset logic itself prompts the action. We need to reduce the left part of the equation—the amount of cash multiplied by turnovers. The government reduced it by means of this confiscation. However, it will print no less than R50 billion in additional new money. Therefore, the money supply will even increase. Then the government decided to reduce the number of turnovers as well. This is why the savings were frozen. If the money of the populace circulates once or twice instead of five times, and maybe not even once, the left part of the equation will be smaller. As a result, trying to keep our current low prices may be possible. (As I see it, this is extreme folly. Prices need to be released, and immediately at that).

[Zhelnorova] How will the current action affect the consumer market?

[Selyunin] Of course, if such an amount of money is confiscated all at once, this will stabilize the situation in the consumer market to some degree. However, nervousness will increase.

Of course, this action will undermine confidence in our currency. You do not know when they are going to rob you.

Prices in the "black market" will soar now. Flight from currency will become even more pronounced.

Official Cited on Price Rise Rumors

PM3101150791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
30 Jan 91 Second Edition pp 1-2

[Interview with A.N. Komin, first deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Prices, by Aleksandr Nikitin in Moscow; date of interview not stated: "Prices Do Not Like 'Parades'"—first two paragraphs are introduction]

[Text] Moscow—Yesterday a number of radio stations, citing the POSTFAKTUM agency, came up with an alarming piece of sensational news: As of 1 February an

increase of 140 percent in retail prices for food and an increase of 70 percent in retail prices for light industry output is allegedly expected. The agency, whose very name seems to oblige it to speak only of what has already happened, has violated its own status. In what exactly, and why?

A.N. Komin, first deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Prices, whom we asked to comment on the POSTFAKTUM report, said:

[Komin] No increase in retail prices on a statewide scale is expected 1 February. And indeed hardly any of our specialists today, even from the government cabinet, is able to point in advance to a specific date for a particular event in the country's economic life. There are very many component elements here and they are constantly changing. And they must all be considered as fully as possible.

[Nikitin] Surely not everything is invented out of thin air? Was there not even... smoke?

[Komin] Perhaps there was smoke for someone. The figures could have come from any unchecked old intermediate materials. No responsible staffer from the USSR State Committee for Prices gave the agency such information. And I am sure he could not have given it.

[Nikitin] But why then, Anatoliy Nikolayevich, do such inaccuracies in the press or simply rumors excite our people's imagination?

[Komin] The social atmosphere in the country is heated. The economic crisis is having an effect. And, of course, there are people who are not averse to continuing to fuel the situation. Some are doing so artificially, "through hearsay," buying goods in the state trade organizations and dreaming of raising prices on the "black market," others are doing it to intimidate people with real civilized market relations in the future, while others are doing it simply to swell their local budgets easily and simply at the expense of the population.

[Nikitin] But if we are to be frank: Is an increase in prices imminent in the near future? Incidentally, many of our readers are asking this question. What can you say in reply?

[Komin] I shall not conceal the fact that a reform of prices formation has in my opinion long been due. And even... overdue: It was necessary two or three years ago, when the situation was more favorable. It is impossible to make successful headway with our "antediluvian" price system. The future market requires a different, more effective and flexible prices system providing a more accurate correlation between production expenditure and revenue. But to elaborate and implement such a reform truly gigantic work is needed. Particularly when it is a case of retail prices. Such a reform cannot take people unawares because prices have to be indexed with a consideration for the material living standard. We will

have to resolve beforehand the specific issues of compensation, that is making good the losses people have incurred from the increased prices. And, of course, our compatriots must know in advance about the prices reform.

[Nikitin] And moreover it is perhaps very important to consider in advance the experience, including negative experience, which already exists in a number of republics and cities, in particular in Moscow. After all, prices are nonetheless increasing rapidly. What can be set against this lack of coordination?

[Komin] It is true that the prices reform is a very complex and delicate matter. I shall merely recall that the events of this January in the Baltic republics had not only national and political causes. The drastic "salvo-like" increase in retail prices by the governments of these republics without deeply thought out compensation also had an effect. And in the Baltic this was not manifested immediately in an acute social eruption.

Yet when you analyze the events taking place, in my view for some reason no special importance is attached to this phenomenon. Prices have increased, albeit to a lesser degree, in a number of other regions.

[Nikitin] Who introduced them there?

[Komin] Most often the republican and local organs of power. As we can see in this instance too the "parade of sovereignties" did not always benefit everyone.

[Nikitin] And what could bring an easing of tension in this serious matter?

[Komin] Above all the joint discussion of the strategy of price formation with all republics.

[Nikitin] Where?

[Komin] I think in the Soviet of the Federation... Prices do not like any "parades."

Republican Economic Sovereignty Viewed

*PM0102110791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
30 Jan 91 Second Edition p 1*

[Article by Gennadiy Yastrebtsov: "Who Is 'Ours' and Who Is 'Theirs'"]

[Text] When you visit plants and associations you sometimes hear engineers and workers say: The enterprise's grounds are packed with nearly finished output but we cannot send it to the consumers—our suppliers in neighboring republics are delaying for weeks or even months the delivery of subassemblies and the necessary "trivia." Here is just one recent fact reported to the editorial office by Sergey Ryabov, our correspondent for Sverdlovsk Oblast. The ferroalloy plant in the Georgian city of Zestafoni is disrupting deliveries of components and raw and semifinished materials for the Sredneuralsk metal structures plant.

In some places interrepublican ties are being grossly sabotaged or simply broken and this localistic [samoyedskiy] process is being promoted to a considerable degree by the aggravation of the political struggle and the desire of some "democratic" leader for full economic independence from the Union or to be more specific for self-isolation to the detriment of the interests of the majority of the population of the republics themselves.

The West European countries, to whose experience the most radically inclined scientists so like to refer, are hurrying toward further integration within the framework of the community. According to press reports, as early as next year they will switch to the formation of a single market and the creation of an economic and currency union.

But what is happening in our long-suffering state? From the platforms of meetings and from the pages of the "independent" press already thoroughly tedious appeals are still being heard for separatism and confrontation, for the priority of republican markets and the creation of their own currencies.

I am far from the thought that, for instance, the head of the Lithuanian parliament is so naive as to fail to understand that the sale of output not only at prices operating inside the country but even at world prices is far from always capable of bringing a steady income to a republic which is developing its economy on the basis of imported raw material. Nonetheless the Lithuanian leaders do not tire of repeating the claim that after the final separation from the USSR the people will live an incomparably wealthier life because they will start to use all benefits for themselves, without "foreigners."

Oh, that persistent motive of ours and theirs! It is well known that Lithuania meets 74 percent of its ferrous metal requirements, 97 percent of its nonferrous metal requirements, 100 percent of its coal requirements, and 77 percent of its gas requirements through imports from other regions. This, of course, in no way means that the republic gives the Union nothing in exchange. It does, and quite a lot. As a whole resources worth 7 billion rubles [R] are imported into Lithuania and resources worth nearly R6 billion are exported. And there is nothing special about that fact. The customary, normal practice of any society which calling itself civilized.

You ask: Why break a lance, why break established ties and dismantle economic relations that have lasted many years? If it is for the sake of political ambitions, then that is not only cruel with regard to one's own people but also improvident from the economic viewpoint: The price may prove too high. Life proves very obviously that without retaining the union market it is impossible to ensure even halfway tolerable work by the national economy or the development of the social sphere of the majority of republics.

Alas, the voice of reason is so far drowning in the howling of the passions evinced at meetings. Populist

slogans call for immediate regional independence. Inter-republican ties are weakening. Back in 1989 the union republics reduced deliveries of foods to other regions of the country. Thus, Lithuanian reduced meat exports by one-quarter although meat production increased. In 1990 there was a further reduction in the volumes of trade turnover between the union republics. The reasons are well known: political and economic chaos, the decline in the ruble's exchange rate, the lack of confidence in the future on the part of the producers of material values. Every leader, jettisoning long-term ideas, is trying to "extract" at least something for his own republic, his own city, his own plant. Exchange in kind is expanding and contract commitments are being relegated to the background.

It is shameful and painful with our country's enormous wealth to be indigent, relying on being helped by an "uncle." It is also stupid and shortsighted to isolate ourselves, to separate, to go each to his own corner and wait for everything to take shape of its own accord.

Tell me who now can be seriously interested in the wretched idea of creating on the territory of the USSR dozens of small "dukedom" that will start to snatch bread from each other in an exhausting internecine struggle? Do we all need that now?

When I visited several oblasts of the West Ukraine quite recently I was convinced of how industrial enterprises are suffering from the fact that their suppliers, especially from the Transcaucasus, are failing to meet their commitments. It was there, in the Ukraine, that I heard a plethora of opinions from leaders of regional fronts and political movements fighting for the division of Soviet people once again into ours and theirs. I shall not conceal the fact that the authors and propagandists of this policy are not that simple and not always frantically direct. They spoke of the friendship of the peoples, of their economic ties, but they were most diverse ties and only horizontal ones so that the Union, they said, would not impede the peoples' self-determination and would not construct "great-power machinations."

To be honest, it was unusually hard to talk with people in the grips of some idee fixe or mania. They only heed themselves. For instance, at one meeting here I merely hinted at the need to stabilize the situation, which would enable all the republics to elaborate a sound, coordinated concept for overall economic actions. People immediately began to boo me: Look, they said, he has come to campaign among us for the Union treaty but we don't need him, we will agree ourselves if we want to with any republic without the mediation of the center.

And again that same hackneyed thesis of ours and theirs...

Will you finally understand, my dear compatriots who live and work in different republics, that we are not strangers, since we have a common history and a common destiny. And our home is a common one. A good home and a spacious one—there is enough room

for everyone. Yes, for many decades there have been many grave, tragic events in this home and a lot of garbage has accumulated. But surely not only in our home? Let's discard them into the garbage heaping the old things no one needs any more. But why destroy the walls and the roof because of a pile of garbage?

Of itself the idea of the republics' economic sovereignty is a healthy one. It is a bad thing when attempts are made to use it not to strengthen the unity and integrity of the general national economy but to set against each other the interests of the peoples inhabiting the country, when it is used for selfish populist maneuvers leading to an impasse. The danger of the euphoria of immediate and complete sovereignties also consists in the fact that it threatens the emergence of a tough new diktat on production and that is hardly compatible with market relations.

In advocating today a strong power in the country, the Communists are by no means fighting for a return to former times, to the administrative edict system. But nor can we allow anarchy, collapse, and separatism. We are in favor of pooling honestly and sensibly the interests of individual territories and the interests of the whole country.

There has been enough of the war of laws, the war of finances, the war of regional economic concepts. People have grown tired of all that, they want a peaceful, industrious, normal life.

Military

General Staff Directorate Chief on Joint Patrols

PM3101153691 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 30 Jan 91 First Edition p 1

[Interview with Major General V.A. Solomatina, chief of USSR Armed Forces General Staff Directorate, by USSR Defense Ministry press center; date not given: "Patrols in the City"]

[Text] As has been reported in the press, on the basis of a joint order of the USSR internal affairs and defense ministers, joint patrolling by militiamen and servicemen is being introduced as of 1 February in Moscow, the capitals of union and autonomous republics, kray and oblast centers, and cities with a military garrison. We asked Major General V.A. Solomatina, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff Directorate, to comment on this decision.

"First of all," Viktor Aleksandrovich said, "I should like to stress that this order is published in fulfillment of the USSR Council of Ministers resolution of 11 October 1990, 'Urgent Measures To Strengthen the Rule of Law and Consolidate Law and Order in the Country,' and the government directive of 27 October 1990.

"Patrolling in military garrisons, as you know, is common practice. It is organized in accordance with the

Garrison and Guard Service Regulations, ratified, incidentally, by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium on 30 July 1975. Its aim is to maintain order and a high level of military discipline among servicemen on the streets and in public places, at railroad stops and stations, at ports, airports, and also in populated areas adjoining garrison areas.

"As far as joint patrolling with militia duty details is concerned, this has been done before too. At the request of local authorities joint patrolling is being utilized right now in some cities, with appreciable results in improving law and order. The spread of this practice to other large cities has been occasioned by the worsening criminogenic situation. It has become unsafe for people to be in the streets and public places, especially in the evening. Reinforcing militia patrols with troops will undoubtedly improve the situation to a certain extent. In any case, the measures that are being taken will be of some use in our opinion."

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Tell us about these measures in more detail.

[Solomatina] In organizing joint service the servicemen will be strictly guided by the requirements of USSR and union republic laws. Militiamen and servicemen will not be interchangeable. That is to say, the militiamen will ensure social order, and the servicemen in the patrol will maintain discipline among servicemen. At the same time they will not be idle witnesses if someone tries to commit a misdemeanor, let alone a crime. The servicemen will undoubtedly come to the aid of the militiamen.

I can adduce quite a few examples of occasions on which our patrols acted in this way. Thus on 1 January a brawl among the local inhabitants in a settlement near Kutaisi was stopped thanks to the decisive actions of patrol chief Senior Lieutenant F. Pardayev. Had the officer not intervened, the consequences could have been extremely serious. He was obliged to use his firearm. The actions taken by the patrol chief were acknowledged to be legal by the military prosecutor.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Some people say that troops will be driving around the streets in armored carriers and will even carry weapons...

[Solomatina] These are farfetched fears, although in actual fact in the joint order the military unit commanders are instructed to have a permanent reserve of patrols on vehicles (armored carriers) and duty subunits in each garrison. They will be stationed on the garrison territory. But this is essentially the same as before. Duty subunits have been designated in case of emergencies. By the way, during the earthquake in Armenia it was precisely these subunits that first helped the militia to guard savings banks and rushed to help people in distress. Remember the explosions in Arzamas and Sverdlovsk. In neutralizing the consequences, incidentally, the duty subunits of these garrisons were also the first to help.

Unfortunately, the realities of our life are such that the army has already had to defend citizens from extremist outrages and pogroms. The tragic events in Sumgait, Baku, Fergana, and Osh are still fresh in the memory. We must not allow them to be repeated. If this happens the order makes provision for appointing servicemen equipped with firearms to joint patrolling duties, as was the case before. We cannot exclude other cases either, in which mass disturbances fraught with danger for people's lives could break out. I think this is clear to any sensible person.

Those who saw in this section of the order a "threat to democracy" are in my view pursuing some other objective. I am unable to assess all this as anything other than one more attempt by certain people to use any pretext for inflaming passions and whipping up antiarmy speculation.

Navy Captain Describes Munitions Dumped in 1947

PM2901160391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
26 Jan 91 Union Edition p 6

[Letter from Reserve Captain Third Rank Konstantin Petrovich Terskov under "From the International Desks' Mailbag" rubric: "Task Fulfilled—Bombs Disposed Of"]

[Text] IZVESTIYA No 294 dated 23 October 1990 published an article by M. Zubko headlined "Skagerrak—Sinister Find" reporting that a Swedish scientist and deep sea researcher, Bjorn Akerlund, who was drawing up maps of the position of ships sunk in Swedish coastal waters, discovered in the strait of Skagerrak a whole pile of remains of warships belonging to fascist Germany. Ammunition, bombs, and mines full of toxic substances were found in their holds. The article said that fishermen from the Danish island of Bornholm were poisoned as they dragged munitions and bombs from the bottom of the sea.

During my service in the Baltic Fleet in May 1947, I was sent by the Fleet Command to the town of Schwerin in Mecklenburg province to take part in the disarmament of fascist Germany. In Schwerin I was given the task of disposing at sea of 40,000-50,000 tonnes of aircraft bombs filled with toxic substances, that were stored in the town of Wolgast on the banks of the Peene River. Major General Sokolov was in charge of the disposal. Five cargo ships from West Germany and two minesweepers from the Baltic Fleet were under my command. The task consisted in loading the aircraft bombs into the holds of the cargo ships, taking them out to sea, and disposing of them at a depth of no less than 100 meters. The minesweepers ensured that the aircraft bombs that floated on the sea's surface were destroyed. During the period of the bombs' disposal instances were recorded of bombs turning up on Swedish coasts and beaches after being carried there by storms.

The phenomenon of aircraft bombs being washed up on coasts and beaches is explained by the fact that air

trapped in the warhead compartments gave the bombs a certain buoyancy. The bombs were thrown overboard, sank to a certain depth, and then floated. An underwater current would pick up the bombs and carry them toward the Swedish coasts, and then storms would sweep them ashore.

The initial point of disposal was established by the command at 56 miles southwest of the marker buoy at the port of Liepaja in the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]. The time frame was also determined—I was to dispose of the aforesaid load by 1 January 1948.

On 25 May 1947, two cargo ships arrived from Luebeck—the Elbing-4 and Elbing-8. They loaded up by 6 June 1947 and set sail. Together with the cargo ships I set sail for Latvia and the point of disposal; that is, toward the Liepaja port marker buoy. After analyzing the possibility of disposal by the deadline I came to the conclusion that, insofar as the speed of the cargo ships and the capacity of their holds were not great, I would not be able to cope with the task I had been given, and I informed my leadership of this. After studying the depths of the Baltic Sea I proposed new coordinates—five miles south of Christianso Island to the east of Bornholm Island, at a depth of 101 meters, meeting the disposal requirements. After examining my proposal the leadership agreed to carry out the disposal at the proposed coordinates.

In this way, around 5,000 tonnes of chemical munitions were disposed of 56 miles southwest of the marker buoy for the Latvian port of Liepaja, and the remaining 40,000-45,000 tonnes were disposed of south of Christianso Island. Teams of longshoremen recruited from Germany loaded the bombs into the ships' holds and unloaded them into the sea. During disposal one longshoreman was hospitalized in Liepaja port and another in the port of Nekso on Bornholm Island, where he died. And so, the beginning and end of the operation occurred 6 June 1947 and 27 December 1947 respectively.

The article asks: "As an allied power, did our country participate in the burial of German toxic substances? If so, where and in what quantities?" I consider it my duty to tell you about this.

[Signed] Reserve Captain Third Rank Konstantin Petrovich Terskov

Tula Oblast, Kireyevskiy Rayon, Oktyabrskiy Settlement

Army Colleagues Condemn Western Forces Deserter

PM0102092991 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 29 Jan 91 First Edition p 2

[Report by Lieutenant Colonel Yu. Alyayev under "From the Latest Mail" rubric: "Traitor's Trial In Absentia"]

[Text] It is hard to say whether retribution will befall M. Kolesnikov, the former regimental commander who fled from the Western Group of Forces, or whether he will ever come up before the law. But maybe the gravest trial—a trial by his former fellow servicemen and compatriots—has already befallen him...

SOVETSKAYA ARMIYA, the newspaper of the Western Group of Forces, devoted a whole page to letters and statements from readers voicing their attitude toward Kolesnikov's person and conduct. Very different people—a soldier and an officer who served in Afghanistan, a schoolboy and a serviceman's wife, the priest in charge of the Russian Orthodox church in Potsdam and even a former policeman from the FRG—agree on one thing: The traitor, whatever motivated him, deserves nothing but contempt.

It is perfectly logical to regard this feature as a kind of indictment against a traitor of the motherland and would have been signed by thousands of people.

Baltic Republics

Troops Said To Increase Strength in Lithuania

LD0102111791 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1043 GMT 1 Feb 91

[By TASS correspondent Kazis Ustila]

[Text] Vilnius, 1 Feb (TASS)—“The statement by the Soviet leaders that the additional contingent of the Soviet Army has been or is being withdrawn from Lithuania is not in accord with reality,” said Kazimieras Motieka, deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Republic, today in reply to a question from a TASS correspondent.

In the opinion of the deputy head of the Lithuanian legislature, “the additional contingent has not been withdrawn anywhere, quite the contrary—it has been increased.” He added that “it can only be a question of redeployment, of troops being moved around.” Kazimieras Motieka backed up his assertions by saying that “the military have not yet returned the buildings which they seized.” “Servicemen are continuing to carry out patrols both in military uniform and after changing into militia uniform.” They “are using tanks and armored personnel carriers to block the roads.”

Lithuania Leaders on ‘Anxiety’ Over Army Patrols

LD3101231191

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian at 2000 GMT on 31 January carries a 60-minute “Government Hour” program broadcast live from the Supreme Council building in Vilnius, conducted by Auris Azubalis, information representative of the Lithuanian Supreme Council. Azubalis informs listeners that the following are taking part in this broadcast: the Supreme Council Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis; Minister of Internal Affairs Marijonas Misiukonis; Procurator General Arturas Paulauskas; General Director of the Defense Department Audrius Butkevicius; and Head of the Secretariat of the Republican Election Commission Gediminas Bulota.

Landsbergis speaks first about the upcoming Army patrolling. He says: “There is anxiety, there are preparations. The most important is our spiritual determination, because this action is license on the part of a foreign army. This is a kind of occupation action, because the Army assumes government functions. We do not know its scale but we have a very clear attitude in this respect, if this means complete occupation of Lithuania, with the occupation government attempting to take everything away; our attitude is not to cooperate. And now, if the planned step is taken, our state structures will not cooperate, and we ask the residents and citizens to be careful, behave seriously and with dignity, and, as before, refrain from yielding to provocations if there are any impudent hooligan-like actions.”

Minister of Internal Affairs Misiukonis speaks next. After noting that the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Lithuania and the militia are united, he says: “The militia is united in defending the laws, human rights, dignity, honor, health, and property of the citizens. Today Procurator General Arturas Paulauskas, myself, my deputy Vaclovas Zabarauskas, and the head of the Directorate of Internal Affairs of Vilnius City, Vytautas Leibus, had a meeting with the military, the commander of the division of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, and the Vilnius City military commandant. It became clear during this meeting that the military want to introduce patrolling from 1 February in three towns of the republic: Vilnius, Kaunas, and Klaipeda. According to my information, in Kaunas and Klaipeda the military are unwilling to carry out the patrolling. And what will happen in Vilnius? According to the city military commandant and the division commander, the military will patrol at the train station, the bus station, in the area of the Vilnius airport and in the city center. This will happen during the day. The military will patrol without the militiamen. I have already stated today that the militia has no common interests with the military as far as patrolling is concerned.”

Misiukonis says he has been told that each patrol will consist of five people. They will wear military uniform. The soldiers of the interior troops, two persons, will wear militia uniform. There will be eight such patrols, each consisting of five persons, in Vilnius. Thus 40 people will patrol during the day. At night these military men will be joined by up to 18 armed patrol vehicles. Apart from that, from 2200 until 0600 eight posts will control the entry to and departure from Vilnius. He continues: “The military have promised that they will not enter dwellings without representatives of the organs of law and order. There was much talk about the behavior of the soldiers in the past few days, about those tragic events, about innocent victims, and we were told that the soldiers will avoid such actions. I would like to warn people to be more careful, especially motor vehicle drivers.” Procurator General Paulauskas speaks next. He says that this action by the military is unlawful. Among other things, he was told by the military that they will not interfere in the ordinary life of the Vilnius residents, and he asks that in case of some conflict they should contact the Vilnius militia. The military has warned that if they are provoked in any way they will increase patrolling.

Gediminas Bulota briefly describes preparations for the coming poll and hopes that it will take place in an orderly fashion.

Landsbergis then states: “Of course, the actions of the Soviet Army in Lithuanian tomorrow, how it will implement its orders, will be watched on an international scale.” He adds that Western politicians are glad that, allegedly, the withdrawal of the Soviet Army is taking place, and some think that it has been withdrawn; they should see in the streets of our towns how it is being withdrawn and how tension is being (?increased). He continues: “Maybe this patrolling will not last long.

Therefore we should not provide any grounds to justify it. It often happens that they try to provoke something, and then the results of this provocation justify the provocation itself. We must not help in this".

The remaining passages—largely indistinct—deal with the investigation of the Army crimes on 11-13 January, the changing views toward the Soviet Union in the West, and asking Lithuania's people to remain calm and avoid provocations.

Military Sees No Need To Patrol in Siauliai

*LD3101183191 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian
1700 GMT 31 Jan 91*

[Text] Jonas Rudzinskas, chairman of the Siauliai town council, has met the (?commanders) of the military units stationed in Siauliai. They discussed how the USSR president's decree will be implemented in Siauliai from tomorrow, 1 February. The military stated that the situation in Siauliai is stable and there is no need to organize any patrolling.

Lithuanian Government Calls for 'Passive Protest'

*LD0102030891 Vilnius International Service
in English 2300 GMT 31 Jan 91*

[Text] The Lithuanian Government has published an appeal because of the continuing aggression against the Lithuanian state and the nation. The appeal gives a warning that actions by Soviet troops may become even more cruel and provocative. In the time of a crucial trial, Lithuania's only real and invincible weapon is passive protest, the government appeal says. It calls upon young people not to give in to provocations, and thus ultimately to come out the winner in defending the honor of the Lithuanian state.

Supreme Council Urges Civic Solidarity

LD3101184891

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian at 1635 GMT on 31 January carries a 25-minute live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius. The session is in progress when the relay begins at 1635 GMT. The Lithuanian prosecutor general is delivering a report on the events in Lithuania on 13 January.

He states that an investigation into the events in Vilnius that occurred from 11 to 13 January is currently in progress. He notes that two people are still missing. He reports that the circumstances surrounding the deaths of 12 people have been established—they were either shot or run over by tanks. He adds that the circumstances surrounding the deaths of two more people—one young man and one Soviet military man—have not yet been determined.

The prosecutor general's report indicates that 580 people have been reported wounded or injured, but the number

may be higher. He says that there are difficulties in carrying out the investigation, because cooperation with the USSR Procuracy is nonexistent or, at best, very poor. The USSR Procuracy wants to carry out the investigation by themselves, without the help of the Lithuanian authorities.

Various questions about the investigation are then asked by deputies.

At 1647 GMT, Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council, takes the floor. He says: "I wish to express my opinion and to ask for a show of support for it by everyone showing up tomorrow morning. This is important. We do not know what measures may be taken tonight [the night of 31 January to 1 February] by the Soviet Union's military or political leadership. They have already given certain orders. They may implement them in a total or partial way, by harsh or soft measures. There may be various problems."

In regard to the military leadership, he urges caution "if the military leadership begins controlling the situation in Lithuanian towns, including the voting papers that are being printed and distributed."

He says: "Therefore, for us to break our session until Monday would be irresponsible. We can sacrifice one or one and one-half hours tomorrow to be here as necessary. I ask all present and all others to demonstrate civic understanding and the solidarity of our deputies." He adds: "I ask you to support this proposal."

Deputy Abisala then states that military patrols have already started. He says: "I can add that the patrols on the Kaunas to Garliava road started today, early in the morning. One local deputy was stopped and searched."

The live relay is discontinued at 1700 GMT.

Landsbergis Addresses Council

*LD3101125191 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian
0905 GMT 31 Jan 91*

[Speech by Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council, at the Lithuanian Supreme Council Plenum in Vilnius—live]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] We can say that the tension in Lithuania appears to be generally subsiding—the tension between the organs of the legal authorities and foreign troops engaged in acts of coercion.

Perhaps this apparent easing of tension is connected with the price we had to pay—the price of life. We lost one more life today. This causes protests and creates certain pressure on the Soviet authorities. It is a pity that in order to buy more peace we have to pay this price.

It can be that there is a certain link with the talks that took place in Washington between the Soviet foreign minister and top U.S. officials. We have noticed that the statement made by President Bush, which also concerns

us, was given a wide comment in the press yesterday. We can give various interpretations to the hope that the promise given by the Soviet leadership to withdraw a certain number of troops from Lithuania will be carried out and that this number will be considerable.

Unfortunately, the question and the obligation on the part of Soviet leadership were not formulated in such a way that would speak of withdrawal from specific areas; to withdraw the Interior Ministry troops from certain installations or something similar that would be clearly seen.

Otherwise, we know about all sorts of relocation and rearrangements, when some are withdrawn and others are moved in, which makes it easy to conceal some other intentions.

Therefore, I would not be able to say from this viewpoint that the threat has diminished. We do not know yet if the decrees and regulations will be implemented and on what scale by which virtual martial law will be imposed beginning 1 February in the cities of Lithuania as well as in most cities of the USSR. [passage omitted]

Calls 'To Be Ready for Resistance'

LD3101162291 Moscow TASS in English 1402 GMT 31 Jan 91

[By TASS Correspondent Kazis Ustila]

[Text] Vilnius January 31 TASS—Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis believes that tension between Vilnius and Moscow "is being somewhat relieved".

Speaking on the political situation in the republic in parliament today, he argued, at the same time, that the threat of Lithuania was not removed. He sees danger, in part, if the decrees by the Soviet president and defence and interior ministers about the joint patrol of streets by police and troops begin to be implemented from February 1. This measure is enforced on the entire territory of the USSR.

Landsbergis called "to be ready for resistance with the help of discipline and restraint and, if need be, by disobedience and refusal to cooperate."

Landsbergis said the preparation of a political treaty between the Lithuanian Republic and the Russian Federation, which was expected to be signed soon, was completed and he described it as "a very important achievement".

Landsbergis Praises Peoples' Resolve in Crisis

LD0102111191 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 0500 GMT 1 Feb 91

[Excerpts] One of the world's crisis areas is the Soviet Union and the Baltics, which are within this. Regarding his country, Lithuanian President Landsbergis told

Jozsef Barath, our correspondent, about a creeping occupation [kuszó megszállás]. [passage omitted]

Lithuania is capable of determining its fate, Vytautas Landsbergis said late last night in an interview with Radio Hungary. As the republic's president said, his people's resolve is the guarantee that the Lithuanians are not at the mercy of either Russia or the West's readiness to help.

Troops Moved From FRG Said To Cause 'Trouble'

LD3101165991 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 1500 GMT 31 Jan 91

[Text] The Soviet leadership has recently maintained that a certain number of troops are being withdrawn from Lithuania. This is very hard to believe, because promises have consistently been unfulfilled, and even the contrary has occurred. That is why the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Germany via Lithuania causes concern.

Two weeks ago I reported that the ferry-boat Kaunas carried servicemen and armored vehicles from Mukran on the international sea link. They did not stop on our territory. Is such unpleasant cargo still being transported by the international railroad and the sea link? This is what I asked Vytautas Vaicekauskas, director of the international sea link.

[Begin recording] [Vaicekauskas] At first it was only the Kaunas. Now this cargo is arriving almost every day. We have a lot of trouble. The troops are demoralized and the soldiers are ignoring their officers. [passage omitted] A sergeant can tell a colonel with a wave of his hand to get out of his way because the Marines are coming and they have the right to go to the head of the line for coffee. In short we find it unpleasant. When the military equipment and servicemen go ashore their behavior is rather unpleasant, they also steal and we (?have to protect everything). [passage indistinct]

[Jankauskas] How long will the transportation of the military equipment and soldiers continue?

[Vaicekauskas] Unfortunately, I think this will go on for a long time, about four years. As far as we know there are about half a million troops there, you can calculate: One ferry brings 100 or 200 soldiers. It is no secret that it will take about four years, because Poland refused to allow such cargo through its territory, so a decision was made to use sea routes. And the most convenient at the moment is the ferry. [end recording]

Vilnius Reports Iceland Recognizes Independence

LD3101162391 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 1439 GMT 31 Jan 91

[Text] I would like to single out from a number of the most important news items the information which was announced today on the Soviet Television news program which we call here (?TSN).

According to this program, official documents have been sent in from Iceland saying that it recognizes Lithuania's independence. The first Western state has therefore recognized free Lithuanian state.

By the way, Iceland is not linked with the Soviet Union by wide-ranging economic and political ties; perhaps only some agreements on fishing zones and their range. Several weeks ago we received information that these negotiations had also been discontinued in Reykjavik.

Iceland Confirms Restored Ties

*LD0102120691 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian
1105 GMT 1 Feb 91*

[Text] The newspaper RESPUBLIKA announces good news, which we have heard more than once, that the Icelandic Foreign Ministry has confirmed that diplomatic relations with Lithuania are being restored.

An information bureau of the Nordic Council of Ministers is being opened today in Vilnius.

Lithuania's Vagnorius on Relations With Moscow
*AU3101110591 Budapest NEPSZAVA in Hungarian
28 Jan 91 p 3*

[Interview with Lithuanian Prime Minister Gedeminas Vagnorius by Csaba Szerdahelyi; place and date not given: "Negotiate Before It Is Too Late"—first paragraph is NEPSZAVA introduction]

[Text] During these weeks of crisis, the Vilnius legislature and the council of ministers are busy day and night, and they do not take any holidays. That is why it is hardly surprising that we only managed to speak to Gediminas Vagnorius—elected as prime minister of Lithuania only two weeks ago—during a coffee break.

[Szerdahelyi] As far as I know, you are the youngest Lithuanian prime minister ever. Does the responsibility not crush you?

[Vagnorius] Yes, to my knowledge, there has never been a younger Lithuanian prime minister. I am 34 years old. Until now, I worked as an economist, and I think that during the next few years, this background could be very important for Lithuania as the country reaches its independence. Naturally, I feel the burden of responsibility, but I am ready to take on the challenge.

[Szerdahelyi] Have you also pledged your allegiance to Lithuania?

[Vagnorius] Upon my appointment as prime minister that was "obligatory," but I would have pledged my allegiance anyway.

[Szerdahelyi] Reports concerning your election were rather confused. Could you tell us about your election?

[Vagnorius] Before the siege of the Vilnius television building, in the middle of the crisis, on 10 January, we

lived through our most difficult day. The Prunskiene government had just resigned, and the newly elected president, Albertas Simenas, had completely disappeared. For almost 24 hours, nobody knew anything about him, various horror-stories were reported about his detention and forced transportation to Moscow. That is why the government elected me on 10 January, but in the late afternoon of that day Simenas entered the legislature building. For just a few minutes, we did not know who would be in charge of things in the future. Unfortunately, Simenas' nerves were shattered, and he still has to stay in the hospital for treatment.

[Szerdahelyi] Given the present circumstances, what can the Lithuanian government do?

[Vagnorius] Despite these war-like conditions, we are doing everything possible so that life and work may continue in a normal way. We have to work—very hard—today, so that we may have something to live on tomorrow. In any case, we have to break away from Moscow's central direction because it is nothing but a burden nowadays—and that does not apply only to Lithuania. We have to establish new relations, or rather, we have to establish long awaited real relations. The Baltic "little common market" on its own would have few chances of winning a battle, but we have found a strong Russian partner in the form of Boris Yeltsin. Some people say that Vilnius would die without Moscow. Well, these people are very wrong, because for a very long time Lithuanians had to depend on their own work, and they did not starve to death. Under real market conditions, the Baltics could play a significant part in world trade.

[Szerdahelyi] You just mentioned relations with Russia. Are we to understand that you are no longer interested in a dialogue with Moscow?

[Vagnorius] As long as we have to shake with fear because we are living in an occupied country and we do not know when or where we are going to be attacked, we have nothing to discuss. Central measures taken these last few days clearly indicate that Mikhail Gorbachev relies solely on the Army, on the commando troops of the Interior Ministry, and on the KGB. I feel that central dictatorial steps only allow for superfluous and superficial dialogue. During the next few weeks, we would prefer to establish appropriate relations within the country with other republics—following the Russian example—before it is too late.

[Szerdahelyi] Mrs. Prunskiene traveled abroad a lot in order to ask for help. Will you continue with that policy?

[Vagnorius] The "only" thing that people are protesting against abroad is the fact that Moscow has carried out a bloody intervention in the Baltics, but everybody seems to defend this alleged perestroika. That is why it will be more important to look for solutions at home in the near future. Naturally, we would very much need moral and financial support from the West, but we no longer entertain any illusions.

[Szerdahelyi] I have already mentioned Mrs. Prunskiene. Could you confirm that her predecessor is in Germany?

[Vagnorius] I think so, although I have no official information.

[Szerdahelyi] If Moscow should head for dictatorship—or, to put it more elegantly, presidential rule—what will happen to Lithuania?

[Vagnorius] You know perfectly well what will happen! However, until the very last subjugation, we will not provide a single excuse! Finally, allow me to thank our Hungarian friends for their help, and for the fact that, as far as I know, many of them are on our side in spirit. I say it from the bottom of my heart: Thank you, Hungary!

Saudargas Sees 'No Advantage' in Moscow Talks

PM3101113291 Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD
in Dutch 24 Jan 91 p 7

[Report by Peter Michielsen on interview with Lithuanian Foreign Minister Algirdas Saudargas on 24 January at The Hague: "Lithuania: If the West Does Not Make a Choice Now, It Is Making the Wrong Choice"]

[Text] The Hague, 24 Jan—"The West must do something now, must recognize Lithuania now. After the bloodbath in Vilnius there are no more refusals, no excuses, no Gulf war. Very dangerous processes are in motion, and after the bloodbath the Lithuanians are still treading the path of a peaceful solution, but it is the West's move, and if it does not make a choice now it will be making the wrong choice."

Algirdas Saudargas is Lithuania's foreign minister. He drank his coffee in a cafe in The Hague—a very weary, very tall man with thin blond hair and bushy blond eyebrows. My prime minister, he said, hastily sent me abroad on Friday 11 January, the day before the "Black Berets" of the Soviet Interior Ministry stormed the television station in Vilnius and killed 14 Lithuanians, because, he said, we had seen the attack coming: "I immediately crossed the border into Belorussia, and from there went to Poland, before the Soviet troops closed our borders." The legislature has empowered him, in the event of a coup against the government of President Landsbergis, to form a government in exile but, Algirdas Saudargas said, things have not gone that far yet. "The democratic state is still functioning, we are still master in our own house." Since his departure he has been doing what he calls his normal diplomatic work. In Poland he talked to Minister Skubiszewski, in Bonn with Genscher, in London with Hurd, in Brussels with Eyskens, in The Hague with Van den Broek: "I have not asked for anything. I have given explanations. I have told them about our historic setback."

The time has come to act, Saudargas said. After the Vilnius bloodbath and that in the Latvian capital of Riga, it is clear that in the Baltic countries a scenario is being unfolded and no one knows what the next step will

be. The scenario had already begun to run on the Monday before the bloodbath. The soldiers began to arrest young men to take them into the Army. The timing worked out well with the Gulf war link; the ultimatum was running out, the deadline was approaching, the world was looking the other way. But they miscalculated, Saudargas said: "They knew that there was dissatisfaction in Lithuania with the Landsbergis government. Prices had just been increased drastically. It is logical that there would be dissatisfaction at such a time. That is where they went wrong, because when they intervened the Lithuanians forgot their dissatisfaction and gave Landsbergis their massive backing." He laughed. "A man like Brazauskas (leader of the Saudargas Communist Party, and a supporter of independence, just like Landsbergis—Michielsen note) is a peasant, a nice, impressive peasant. Landsbergis, on the other hand, looks like a professor, a little, colorless man. But in times of danger Landsbergis is a real leader, and you will see: The Lithuanians may be dissatisfied with his economic policy, but when we vote on independence 9 February all these dissatisfied Lithuanians will be in the polling booths, and then they will see the blood of our martyrs on the wall, and I know very well how they will vote." If Moscow's scenario was intended to bring the Lithuanians to their knees with the bloodbath, it has failed, Saudargas said: It has only made the Lithuanians more determined.

The storming of the television tower by the Black Berets was not—as had been expected—followed by an attack on the parliament, and in Riga the Interior Ministry was stormed by Soviet commandos, but later evacuated. "It is unclear exactly how the scenario is supposed to run. Perhaps they only wanted to send a signal: Some blood on the street is sometimes enough; it is a form of terror. Perhaps they were also frightened by the lack of support from the people, which they had counted on. No matter: It is now time for a response from the West. Gorbachev is hesitating. Politics still means something to them, politics still has value. If nothing happens, they will immediately make use of the Gulf war again and attack. Those people who like shooting only wait for the most favorable moment."

Saudargas sees no advantage at all in talks with Moscow, sees nothing in a Union treaty, and nothing in the Council of the Federation on which the presidents of all Soviet republics sit. "How can you ask something like that? In Lithuania they shoot people dead in the street, and you ask about the Union treaty? Read history: How many Union treaties did Stalin sign? They occupied us, they annexed us, they threw the KGB net over us, but we—we have escaped! We are no longer a part of the Soviet Union—that is a fact, and I tell you: We will never go back. We lost a million dead in Siberia. We have brought their bones back. Now we are outside the Union and they can be no suggestion of political ties with that Union."

Algirdas Saudargas said that there are those, in Lithuania too, who say that the step-by-step method delivers better

results. "Out of the question. You are inside or you are outside. Every compromise WITH the Soviet Union is a compromise WITHIN the Soviet Union. Listen, we were openly occupied. We are independent, we have reversed the Soviet annexation. We have begun to use our old documents again. We have our own well-functioning democracy, our own laws. There is not a single Soviet law still in force in Lithuania. But we are occupied. They occupy our airfields and they guard our borders." If there are to be talks with Gorbachev, Saudargas said, these should only be about "the decolonization of Lithuania," about the withdrawal of the occupying forces. "We are realists. They do not need to go within a few months. They are not leaving the former GDR, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary overhastily either. But they have to go, our independence must be recognized, and Lithuania must disappear from their Constitution."

And if not? Saudargas rubbed his face. "We have always trodden the peaceful path. I want to stress that, emphatically. We will continue to do so. But in the last resort, I do not rule out a civil war. The Lithuanians are determined. Determined."

Saudargas is not afraid of the National Salvation Committee, which opposes independence and demands the resignation of President Landsbergis and the government and the dissolution of the democratically elected legislature. "Their power only reaches within the circle of the Soviet tanks, and if the tanks disappear, that committee will also disappear. The members of the committee are not, and will never be, known. But I have my suspicions."

Gorbachev has said that he only heard about the intervention of the Black Berets in Vilnius afterwards; the intervention is supposed to have been the work of a local commander. He has also said that Moscow's domestic and foreign policy remains unchanged. The Lithuanian minister could only laugh sarcastically. "Is that supposed to convince anybody?" Then, seriously: "The intervention in Vilnius was planned—and long in advance. The Black Berets were brought to Vilnius especially for that purpose, from outside Lithuania. If Gorbachev means what he says, he must get rid of the hard-liners now, at this very moment. If he does not do so he is a hard-liner himself."

Think about Shevardnadze, Saudargas said. Shevardnadze has warned against the new dictatorship. "He has seen the preparations, and now we see what he was warning against. The new dictatorship is already in power. The only thing is that we cannot yet see the dictator's face clearly. We still do not know how many faces the new dictator has," Saudargas said. And he said: "There are an awful lot of unpleasant things still to happen."

Prunskiene Discusses Resignation, Baltic Events

PM3101091391 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jan 91 p 2

[Interview with former Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene by A. Yevtushenko in Vilnius; date not given; followed by V. Zarovskiy "Stop Press" paragraph: "Kazimiera Prunskiene: 'I Am Not an Agent of the Kremlin'"]

[Text] On the day when our correspondent met with Kazimiera Prunskiene in the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet and the republic's Union of Journalists [as published], there was no hint of her impending departure abroad. A couple of days later the "amber lady" disappeared. But the record of the conversation with her remained.

[Yevtushenko] Mrs. Prunskiene, the sharp rise in retail prices in the republic, your resignation, and then the tragic events that followed in Vilnius.... How much is all this interconnected?

[Prunskiene] I would not begin to draw any kind of parallels between the price increases and the military's actions. The unpopular, compulsory, but necessary action cannot be regarded even as the cause of the bloodshed that occurred. The more so because it was committed after my resignation and after prices were returned to their previous level.

[Yevtushenko] What do you think about the possibility of forthcoming elections of a republic president? Have you any intention of standing for this post?

[Prunskiene] Calm political debate is needed concerning this. To date, debates in the legislature are mainly tantamount to showdowns. Alas this is also extending beyond the confines of the Supreme Soviet hall of sessions. So for the time being my political plans are to work actively in the legislature. Although there is the possibility of doing more. On condition that the attempts to discredit me and the threats in the republic Supreme Soviet are finally stopped.

[Yevtushenko] Is your request to be given personal protection also connected with this?

[Prunskiene] Yes, with that too. There have already been attempts on my life, and unknown people continue to threaten reprisals....

[Yevtushenko] In your opinion what role can other states play in the republic's formation?

[Prunskiene] Lithuania is in a triangle consisting of the republic, the USSR, and the world. It is precisely here that other countries' political morals are being tested. Actually the Lithuanian question is one of the main questions on the most serious levels of the foreign agenda.

[Yevtushenko] A series of events preceded your resignation, including the Moscow meeting with the Union president. How did it go?

[Prunskiene] The meeting took place 8 January. I would say the conversation was uncommonly passive, and not emotional. I gained the impression that during the talk Gorbachev was thinking over something of his own. I requested that the military do not use force in removing young people for service in the Soviet Army. He passed me on to Moiseyev on this. He himself emphasized the need to hold a referendum in Lithuania. He said that a new Union premier would be elected.

[Yevtushenko] A number of Lithuanian Supreme Soviet deputies accuse you of having some kind of special ties to Moscow, calling you all but a "Kremlin agent"....

[Prunskiene] Actually, allegations were made concerning my good relations with leaders of the Lithuanian Communist Party on the CPSU platform and with Gorbachev. The Union president's words about how he can conduct a constructive dialogue with me are also recalled.

[Yevtushenko] Do you link the timing of events in the Baltic region with the war in Iraq?

[Prunskiene] I admit the possibility of a direct link. I think that not only the Baltic states feature in the plans of the country's supreme authorities. The beginning of the war in Iraq is an occasion for judging the illusory might of the USSR Armed Forces. Minister Shevardnadze's warning about a dictatorship has so far been borne out in the Baltic region. And there are grounds for wondering who instigated all this. Irrespective of the answer, the president's authority has been badly shaken not only in the country but also abroad.

[Yevtushenko] Mrs. Prunskiene, the information about your role in setting up the Interlit joint Lithuanian-West German enterprise and about its activities is far from favorable to you. What can you say regarding this?

[Prunskiene] These and other defamatory rumors are being spread by my opponents in the Supreme Soviet. All this is an attempt to discredit me.

[Yevtushenko] And the last clarification. Is your daughter really living in the FRG now?

[Prunskiene] I am not going to answer that question....

Stop Press

On Monday [28 January] former Lithuanian Prime Minister K. Prunskiene called the ELTA agency from Germany and reported that the rumors about her fleeing and also requesting political asylum in Switzerland do not correspond to the facts. K. Prunskiene also reported that prior to her departure abroad she made a written statement and notified specific people. She is now the guest of a local Catholic academy in the city of Konigstein.

MOSCOW NEWS Journalists Visit Vilnius

LD0102040891 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in English
2300 GMT 31 Jan 91

[Text] These days Vilnius was visited by a group of leading journalists of the MOSCOW NEWS weekly. The great popularity of the newspaper both in Russia and foreign countries is determined not only by the professional skills of its journalists but also by the democratic ideas spread by the weekly. The MOSCOW NEWS is subscribed to and read in Lithuania, too, and therefore is often quoted by the Lithuanian media.

Yesterday's press conference given by the MOSCOW NEWS journalists can be defined as a meeting of Lithuanian and foreign newsmen and representatives of Russia's democratic forces.

During the recent few years the MOSCOW NEWS, the [word indistinct] upholding perestroika and advocating true democracy, [words indistinct] the newspaper's editor in chief, Yegor Yakovlev, regretted that his generation was not fated to democratize Russia. He said that for a long time his generation had been convinced that it was possible to improve the Soviet system and that Gorbachev was the leader who would make these changes possible. Alas, these were only illusions.

Journalist Yuri Chernichenko, who is very popular in Russia, said he could already now extend his condolences to Soviet Defense Minister Yazov and Interior Minister Pugo because sooner or later Gorbachev would betray them and count them out, as he already has done with other members of his team. Such is Gorbachev's morality and such is his [word indistinct] word, Yuri Chernichenko pointed out.

Only few foreign journalists were present yesterday at the news conference in Vilnius, and they only asked one question. Most probably Yuri Chernichenko's answer unsettled all the other Western reporters and made them keep a low profile.

Yuri Chernichenko of the MOSCOW NEWS gave a pretty angry telling-off to Western journalists, accusing them of being mad about Gorbachev's personality. You created a Gorbachev myth, so now ask yourselves what has happened wrong with your idol. According to Yuri Chernichenko, the Soviet president is only an element of a system. Gorbachev is not independent in making decisions, and his reforms can only go as far as the system allows it. And it is possible in the Communist system that gulags and nationwide repressions will start again.

Editor in chief of the MOSCOW NEWS, Yegor Yakovlev, is confident that under the current circumstances no republic can liberate itself if it goes alone. As soon as the Russian parliament turned into a working body of state power, the pre-empire [as heard] forces sensed danger to their existence, clubbed together, and are now trying to impose neo-Bolshevism. It was neo-Bolsheviks that made an attempt at a coup in Lithuania, said Yegor

Yakovlev. But the 700,000-strong rally in Moscow showing solidarity with Lithuania after the bloody Sunday in Vilnius was proof that Lithuania and the democrats of Russia were standing on the same side of the barricades.

These were the main points of the news conference given by the leading journalists of the MOSCOW NEWS in Vilnius yesterday.

Landsbergis Receives Journalists

*LD3001225191 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian
2002 GMT 30 Jan 91*

[Summary] A group of journalists of the newspaper MOSCOW NEWS is staying in Lithuania. It is led by Chief Editor Yegor Yakovlev. Moscow's journalists were received by the chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council, Vytautas Landsbergis.

Paper Reviews Latest Developments in Lithuania

*PM3101134391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
30 Jan 91 Union Edition p 2*

[Report by special correspondents N. Lashkevich and A. Protsenko: "Lithuania: Incidents Continuing; Aircraft Bomb Exploded Monday on Territory of 'Za Rodinu' Kolkhoz in Shalchininksiy Rayon"]

[Text] As rayon authorities reported to your IZVESTIYA correspondents, a bomb weighing approximately half a tonne was "lost" by a military aircraft and exploded near a kolkhoz [collective farm] farmstead and a residential block.

A water tower collapsed. The explosion made a crater around 7 meters deep and about 15 meters wide. The displaced earth (or bomb fragments?) made a hole in the roof of a structure intended for farm needs. Fortunately there were no casualties.

A Lithuanian MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] special group is clarifying the circumstances of what happened. It is believed that the explosion occurred as a result of inaccurate bombing. The point is that not far from the place where the explosion occurred there is an aviation test range, and in the past inhabitants of the surrounding villages have frequently found unexploded "presents from heaven."

Some details of the "customs" incident which we reported in the last issue are being clarified. It was not a military patrol but "unidentified armed individuals" who attacked two customs posts situated several dozen kilometers apart (near the border with Belorussia). The republic MVD believes that they were members of special purpose militia detachments who have remained under the jurisdiction of the USSR MVD and are loyal to the USSR Constitution. However, at the moment this is just another version of the story.

So who attacked the customs control posts? At the moment this is a riddle. And the republic authorities are being faced with increasing numbers of difficult tasks like this. Lithuanian practice shows that the patrol detachments operate most often on the "without respect of persons" principle. So, instances such as the following become possible: a deputy being detained and forced to stand in the street with their hands up (which is what happened to V. Povilenis, Lithuanian Supreme Soviet deputy), or journalists who have arrived at the scene of an incident to carry out their professional duties being carted off to the commandant's office.

It is becoming clear that in the given case there are no constitutional provisions in force on the protection of citizens' rights and freedoms. And in addition it is not clear who is in charge of the patrolling: Internal Troops, special purpose militia detachments, paratroops, or servicemen from the garrison. Not only are none of these subordinate to any of the representatives of the executive power, they are not even bothering to report their actions.

V. Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, has assessed the joint order on patrols as "the legalization of the military's self-will" and "steps toward a military dictatorship" whose aim is "to destroy the administrative structures in Lithuania." The Lithuanian legislature has adopted a statement protesting against such patrolling.

The Supreme Soviet sees a way out of the prevailing crisis situation in the immediate withdrawal of the assault forces from Lithuania, the return of seized installations, and the continuation of the peaceful process of negotiations. Meanwhile the Lithuanian Communist Party and affiliated sociopolitical organizations are continuing to demand presidential rule and the dissolution of the legislature.

'Missing Persons' in Lithuania's Reappear 28 Jan

*PM3101144191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
30 Jan 91 Union Edition p 1*

[INTERFAX report: "'Missing Persons' in Lithuania Found"]

[Text] As the INTERFAX agency was informed by the Lithuanian Commission for Missing Persons, the last of the people believed to have disappeared 12-13 January during the Vilnius events "turned up" Monday [28 January]. Most of them were young people from various cities in the republic who had simply been continuing to stand guard outside the Lithuanian legislature building, without informing their relatives of their whereabouts.

Thus, assumptions to the effect that the paratroopers had concealed the true number of casualties of "Bloody Sunday" and secretly carried off the bodies have not been confirmed.

Nevertheless, there are still five people left on the overall list of Lithuanians who have been missing since the introduction of extra army contingents into Lithuania.

Latvia Rejects Gorbachev Decree on Joint Patrols

*LD3101195591 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian
1700 GMT 31 Jan 91*

[Text] We are reporting on today's events at the Supreme Council.

First of all, the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Latvia this afternoon adopted a resolution on the participation of Anatolijs Gorbunovs at the sitting of the USSR Federation Council tomorrow, 1 February.

By this resolution, Anatolijs Gorbunovs, as the highest official of our state, is authorized to speak at the Council of the Federation in the name of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Latvia.

He must strictly recall that the Republic of Latvia is an independent state, that it is a subject of international law, and that any questions concerning Latvia's statehood may be tackled only at the international level.

On the question of the referendum, the Republic of Latvia categorically forbids any possibility of a referendum dictated by USSR law in the territory of our state.

President Gorbachev's ukazes on the joint militia-Army patrols in towns and on the methods of struggle by the State Security Committee and the militia against economic sabotage in the Republic of Latvia have no juridical force. These ukazes are nothing but a regular interference in the internal affairs of the Republic of Latvia which will only further destabilize the political situation.

Last of all, Anatolijs Gorbunovs must inform the USSR Council of the Federation that the Republic of Latvia demands the immediate withdrawal from Latvian territory of all the additional contingents of the USSR Armed Forces outside the control of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Latvia, and also of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and State Security Committee army units that have participated in the repressions against the civilian population and against our militia.

Gorbunovs, Godmanis To Attend Federation Council

*LD0102104691 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian
0800 GMT 1 Feb 91*

[Text] A USSR Council of the Federation sitting will take place in Moscow today. Anatolijs Gorbunovs, Latvian Supreme Council chairman, and Ivars Godmanis, Latvian Council of Ministers chairman, have been invited to participate.

Yesterday at the Latvian legislature Presidium, proposals to be presented by Anatolijs Gorbunovs at the Council of the Federation's sitting were confirmed.

The new Union draft treaty will be discussed in Moscow today. In a telephone conversation with Anatolijs Gorbunovs this morning a Latvian Radio correspondent found out that the Council of the Federation participants have not yet been informed about the agenda. According to information available to Ivars Godmanis, even USSR price policy could be discussed. No documents of any kind were issued to the invited participants during the previous days.

Gorbunovs Backs Referendum; People's Front Opposed

*PM3101141591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 30 Jan 91 First Edition p 5*

[Report by correspondent Colonel M. Ziyeminsh under "Direct Line" rubric: "Latvian People's Front Opposes Referendum"]

[Text] Riga, 29 Jan—Many people in Latvia today agree that the republic's future can be determined only by a referendum. "It is my personal opinion," said, for example, A. Gorbunovs, chairman of the Latvian Supreme Soviet, during a meeting with P. Schori, Swedish Foreign Ministry under secretary of state, "that we can organize a referendum. It is possible to hold a nationwide vote in which permanent residents of our republic take part.... I am inclined to suggest a positive vote. That would help Gorbachev decide upon serious talks...."

But the mass media had scarcely published the Latvian legislative chairman's standpoint before his position came under frenzied attack from representatives of radically minded sociopolitical movements.

What do his opponents dislike, then? Above all the idea of a referendum which, according to them, is at variance with the republic Supreme Soviet's declaration of 4 May 1990, which proclaimed that Latvia did not join the USSR voluntarily in 1940 but was incorporated by force. Holding a referendum is tantamount to acknowledging that the "republic is legally part of the USSR" and consequently that the provisions of the law on the withdrawal of republics from the Union apply to it. That clearly does not form part of the plans of the Latvian People's Front, which currently holds a majority in the legislature.

Judging by the Latvian People's Front's program documents, only the "restoration of Latvian independence on the basis of the 1922 Constitution" can be involved here. The period since 1940 does not count, as it were.

Guards Sent to Belorussia; Return Demanded

*LD3101165291 Riga Domestic Service in Russian
1600 GMT 31 Jan 91*

[Text] At a joint session of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Latvia with the leadership of the strategy group of the People's Front faction and the directorate of the People's Front, Andrejs Krastins,

deputy chairman of the Latvian Supreme Council, reported that the five guards detained by OMON [Special Purpose Militia Unit] and who had been kept until now in the interrogation cells of the KGB, were moved yesterday to Belorussia on the authority of the Procuracy of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]. The Supreme Council of the Republic of Latvia demanded that the Procuracy of the Latvian SSR return them to Latvian territory within 24 hours. Agreement in principle was obtained from Dauks, the procurator of the Latvian SSR.

Deputy Procurator General on Riga Inquiry Process

LD3101172291 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT 31 Jan 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] No less than two months will be needed to study the tragic events that led to loss of life in the Latvian capital. A TASS correspondent was told this by Degtyarev, USSR assistant procurator general. An investigation group of 20 people has been formed, comprising representatives of local law enforcement bodies, the USSR Procurator's Office, the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, and the military procuracy.

In connection with the fact that some officials threw doubts on information about violence against the wife of a member of a special assignment militia detachment, Degtyarev explained that a case has been brought following a statement by the victim.

Garrison Official Explains No Confidence Vote

LD3001220691 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 30 Jan 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] In connection with the recent events in Latvia, the garrison of the Riga Militia has expressed lack of confidence in Vaznis, the Latvian interior minister, and has put forward a number of demands to the republican leadership. Taking part in our program is Vladimir Yuriyevich Antyufeyev, deputy head of the criminal investigation department of the Directorate of Internal Affairs in the city of Riga.

[Antyufeyev] The staff of the Militia of the Riga Garrison just like all the Latvian militia have at some time taken an oath of loyalty to our state system. At the same time the republican Supreme Soviet is adopting laws that are contrary to the USSR Constitution and the Constitution of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]. There exist simultaneously on the territory of Riga or, to be more exact, of Latvia, structures and institutions of both the Latvian SSR and the Latvian Republic.

Undoubtedly, since there is a war, there are victims. In this case the victims are the population of the city of

Riga and of Latvia and the representatives of the Riga garrison of the Militia. The Militia staff decided that there should be no further victims. There should not be a single person killed on the territory of Latvia and the territory of the city of Riga.

It is only because of the desire to stabilize the political situation in the Riga Garrison in some way, in order to prevent any extremist attacks—for there are hotheads on both sides—that the initiatory committee made the decision to organize a meeting of representatives of the Riga garrison of the Militia. I must say that the leadership of the Internal Affairs Directorate and of the ministry tried various ways to prevent this meeting from taking place. Nonetheless, this meeting took place and the representatives of the Riga garrison of the Militia—and this has been reported in the central press—voted unanimously for the resolution which we adopted.

This resolution does not contain any political demands. We ask for the laws to be put in order because we are legal men and there can be no dual interpretations of the laws. We should observe only one law. We must know what we are going in for. In no event should our staff or the inhabitants of the city of Riga die because someone is trying to establish himself in the political field and realize his political ambitions.

Our delegation, which includes deputies from the Latvian Supreme Soviet, has already had a meeting with USSR Interior Minister Pugo and with the USSR procurator general, Comrade Trubin. The Union minister of internal affairs assessed our demands as objective.

I would like to take advantage of the opportunity to appeal on behalf of the staff of the Riga Garrison to the Russian Militia to support us.

Officers Denied Vote for Riga City Soviet

PM3101115391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Jan 91 Union Edition p 2

[Report by Irina Litvinova under the "Direct Link" rubric: "Denied Right to Vote"]

[Text] On 27 January elections for the 103d electoral district to the city soviet were held in Riga. The officers living on the district's territory were denied the right to vote.

The reason was that they do not have passports. Many of the military men thus deprived of the right to vote have been living in Riga for many years and are registered here. The commission did not take into account the fact that the military in general do not have passports but only proof of identity. A. Krastynsh, deputy chairman of the Latvian Supreme Soviet, confirmed to deputies from the Equal Rights faction who turned to him for explanations that the electoral commission is operating in accordance with the Supreme Soviet Presidium decree.

Latvian Group Backs Gorbachev Steps on Lithuania*PM3101150591 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA**in Russian 17 Jan 91 p 1*

["All-Latvian People's Assembly Resolution in Support of the USSR President's Measures to Stabilize the Situation in Lithuania"—SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA headline]

[Text] The All-Latvian People's Assembly shares the assessment of the situation in Lithuania given by USSR President M.S. Gorbachev in his speech at the 14 January 1991 USSR Supreme Soviet session, and wholly supports the measures aimed at restoring constitutional order in the republic.

We assess the actions taken by subunits of the Soviet Army and troops from the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] who have been taking part in the efforts to restore constitutional order and secure the fulfillment of the decisions of the Third and Fourth Congresses of USSR People's Deputies and the USSR president's decrees as being highly necessary in order to prevent mass unrest and great bloodshed.

The resolution was unanimously adopted by the All-Latvian People's Assembly.
Riga, 15 January 1991

Recognizes Salvation Committee*PM3101120791 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA**in Russian 17 Jan 91 p 1*

["All-Latvian People's Assembly Resolution"—SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA headline]

[Text] 1. The fact of the transfer of state power to the All-Latvian Public Salvation Committee shall be recognized and its political statement approved.

2. The participants in the All-Latvian People's Assembly call on all labor collectives, working people, and residents of the republic to lend all-around support and assistance to the All-Latvian Public Salvation Committee.

3. Law-enforcement organs shall be required to carry out their duties of safeguarding law and order in the republic on the basis of Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] and USSR legislation and the USSR president's decrees.

The resolution was unanimously adopted by the All-Latvian People's Assembly.

Riga, 15 January 1991

Arrested Latvian Trawler Arrives in Dakar*PM3101112991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian**30 Jan 91 Second Edition p 8*

[TASS report: "Latvian Trawler Delivered to Dakar"]

[Text] The Latvian trawler Nikifor Pavlov arrested by a Senegalese warship in the South Atlantic during the night of 27-28 January has been docked at Dakar. According to preliminary reports, the Western Basin fishing industry association has announced, the trawler's captain and crew are accused of violating Senegal's fishing zone. The USSR Ministry of the Fishing Industry has begun an investigation. Measures are being taken for the trawler's release.

Estonian Legislature To Hold Referendum 3 March*LD3101215191 Moscow TASS in English 2129 GMT 31 Jan 91*

[Text] Tallinn February 1 TASS—The Estonian parliament on Thursday ruled to hold a republic-wide-referendum on March 3, 1991 to gauge the reaction of all Estonians above the age of 18 to the question of whether they want to restore state sovereignty and independence of the Republic of Estonia.

The decision was made after a three-day debate which produced three variants of the resolution. The variant proposed by the presidium of the Estonian parliament and finalized by the Conciliatory Commission won the majority in a vote taken on the last day of debates.

Only four servicemen who are members of the parliament will be allowed to go to the polls.

Prime Minister Edgar Savisaar told the parliament why the 3rd of March was chosen as the date for the referendum. The VECHERNIY TALLINN (EVENING TALLINN) newspaper quoted Savisaar as saying that a telegram had arrived from Rafik Nishanov, head of the Soviet Parliament's Council of Nationalities, saying that the Federation Council was scheduled to discuss questions of the March 17 all-Union referendum on February 1. Some republics are expected to vote in favour of preserving the single Soviet union, in other republics their leaders are expected to create respective conditions. This means that if the leaders fail to create the required conditions, envoys will be sent from the centre for the purpose.

Savisaar said a referendum is long overdue in Estonia. If a referendum in the republic is managed before the all-Union referendum decreed by Moscow, the central authorities will have to face the fact. Moscow may dispute the results of the Estonian referendum, the prime minister said, but the whole world will know what the Estonian people has decided.

The parliament approved the resolution on the interrelations with the USSR Armed Forces during the transition period.

Estonian People's Front Wants 4 March Referendum*LD3101172791 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 31 Jan 91*

[Text] At the session of the Supreme Soviet of Estonia today, matters of local referendum and relations with the

USSR Armed Forces are being considered. As reported by the (Severozapad) agency, a joint meeting of the board of the People's Front of Estonia and people's deputies of the Supreme Soviet of the republic supporting the People's Front took place yesterday. Its participants decided to hold their own republican referendum. This will take place on 4 March without waiting for the Union referendum which, let me remind you, is planned for 17 March.

IZVESTIYA Views Estonian Plans for Referendum

PM0102102791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
1 Feb 91 Union Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent L. Levitskiy: "Will Estonia Have Its Own Referendum?"]

[Text] Tallinn—"It is to be deemed fundamentally correct that a plebiscite (referendum) be held on the territory of the Estonian Republic on the question of Estonian state autonomy before the USSR referendum on the preservation of the Soviet Union."

That was a decision by the Estonian Supreme Soviet Presidium. The resolution was discussed by legislative deputies. Keynote speaker A. Tarand said that a plebiscite was needed as a precautionary political measure. In the speaker's opinion, the majority of the population would back the course of restoring Estonia's statehood.

Since a law on referenda has not yet been adopted in Estonia, the deputies were presented with a draft resolution revealing the voting mechanism. It is proposed that all those permanently residing in Estonia should be entitled to vote—that is, people with permanent residence permits. With the exception of the military. But this right is by no means a promise of future citizenship. A law on its adoption will be examined at a later date. A referendum will require the participation of over one-half of the population. For a decision to be adopted it requires one-half of the votes plus one vote.

The deputies have yet to approve the wording of the question to appear on the ballot paper. Three versions have been proposed. "Should Estonia be an autonomous and independent republic in which the people are the bearers of supreme statehood?" Second—"Should Estonia be an autonomous, independent state?" Third—"Do you consider it necessary to restore Estonia's democratic autonomy outside the USSR?"

Judging by the deputies' reaction, none of the proposed wordings will be adopted verbatim. The multiplicity of political forces is the problem. A substantial section of them—radical ethnic movements—will insist on the term "restoration of statehood." The final decision will be known Thursday. The speaker suspended the sitting of the legislative session—one-third of the deputies (representing the People's Front) had gone to their own conference.

The majority of its participants favored holding a referendum; definitely before 17 March. The question to be put to the vote will be that of Estonia's status as a state rather than that of preserving the Soviet Union. According to many observers' forecasts, the referendum will take place 24 February on the anniversary of the conclusion of the Tartu peace treaty between Estonia and Soviet Russia.

Only recently the idea of a referendum was totally rejected by the People's Front, the republic's leadership, and the radical ethnic movements. Literally only a few days ago delegates of the congress of the autonomous Estonian Communist Party also came out against a referendum. Only the Estonian Communist Party and some public organizations representing the Russian-speaking population openly advocated it. What has caused the politicians' about-face?

"Estonia's political development is to some extent in an impasse. Our movement toward autonomy requires an argument that would be difficult to contest. That is, the direct expression of the people's will. We should have held a referendum at the end of last year," one participant of the People's Front conference believes.

Estonian Presidium Statement on Joint Patrols

LD3101152791 Tallinn Estonian Television Network
in Estonian 1900 GMT 28 Jan 91

[Text] Now we will broadcast the Supreme Soviet Presidium statement on the activity of Soviet Army patrols on the territory of the Republic of Estonia:

According to joint directive number 493/518 of the USSR Ministry of Defense and the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs on 29 December 1990, Soviet Army units stationed in the Republic of Estonia have been given an order to patrol the territory of the Republic of Estonia. The use of armored vehicles, firearms, and special means have been envisaged for patrols. The abovementioned activity is being substantiated by a need to improve the protection of public order. The Republic of Estonia Supreme Soviet Presidium considers patrols of this kind unlawful, provocative, and aimed against the Republic of Estonia. In this way the presence of the Soviet Army in the center of political and economic life in the Republic of Estonia will be increased and pressure will be exerted on the Republic of Estonia. In the present, tense situation this may result in serious consequences.

The Presidium emphasizes that the rights and duties given to the police and militia by Republic of Estonia laws will not be extended to the military. The Presidium considers the joint activity of the Republic of Estonia militia-cum-police formations with Soviet Army units over organizing patrols to be impermissible, and its resolution supports the protocol resolution of the Republic of Estonia Government on 21 January of this year with respect to the joint USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs and the USSR Ministry of Defense directive.

[Signed] Arnold Ruutel, chairman of the Republic of Estonia Supreme Soviet

Commander Says Army Not To Work With Militia

LD0102102991 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 0700 GMT 1 Feb 91

[Text] What does Vice Admiral Yuriy Belov, commander of Tallinn Garrison, think about fulfilling the joint [Yazov-Pugo] directive? There is an article on this in *PAEVALEHT* [daily paper]. He said yesterday that Army patrols in the streets will not coordinate their work with the militia. In the present situation there is no need for this. A three-man military patrol will walk around the airport, the bus station, the train station, and other places frequented by the public. The patrol's task is to check the documents of the military only. As long as there is no order to this effect they will not interfere in civilian matters.

As far as the fate of those young men who are doing alternative service and who are avoiding the Soviet Army is concerned, the vice-admiral said that the garrison cannot provide an answer to this issue as the problem is being handled by the military commissariat. The commissariat, however, could not say anything other than this: The problem must be resolved by the republican government.

Estonia Said To Yield to Moscow on Draft Issue

LD3101150891 Stockholm Domestic Service in Swedish 1130 GMT 31 Jan 91

[Text] In Estonia, the government has yielded to pressure by Moscow regarding the recruitment of conscripts, and the government is now in danger of losing the confidence of the young people in Estonia:

[Tallinn correspondent Anders Eriksson] Estonian Prime Minister Edgar Savisaar told his legislature that he had agreed with Soviet Defense Minister Dmitriy Yazov that the Estonian conscripts would be allowed to do their military service in Estonia or in the other Baltic states. He had not received any direct promise from Yazov; it was, rather, an objective. Savisaar immediately received a shower of protests from the other members of the legislature. Someone has struck terror in our prime minister, said Tiit Made, who now feared that Savisaar had sold the fate of the young Estonian boys in secret talks in Moscow.

The question of military service is a fateful question for the Estonian Government. Last autumn, it called on young Estonian men to refuse to do military service, referring to the view that the Soviet Army was an army of occupation. Very few also turned up at the callups. Instead, they were offered civilian service in their home country. Now, it seems that the Estonian Government has concluded an agreement with Moscow, which, it is true, means that most of those liable to military service are spared from being sent away to the Asiatic or other

remote parts of the Soviet Union. But, at the same time, this is a considerable step backward from the original principle. Thus, it also seems as if Moscow has managed to frighten at least the Estonian Government to make concessions. The recruitment for the Army was just the reason that Moscow originally used for sending paratroopers and Interior Ministry special troops, the so-called Black Berets, to the Baltic. If the Estonian Government does not change its mind and if the legislature does not cancel the government's decision, the youths in Estonia will lose a large part of their confidence in their politicians. The people do not tolerate such concessions, however necessary the politicians regard them.

Differences Between Estonia, Other Baltics Viewed

LD3101175791 Tallinn Estonian Television Network in Estonian 1930 GMT 24 Jan 91

[Studio discussion program with Vaino Valjas, chairman of the independent Communist Party of Lithuania, and Jaak Allik, member of the party's politburo, chaired by Virve Liivanomm; date not given—live or recorded]

[Excerpts] [Liivanomm] [passage omitted] In our events here in the Baltics, these bloody events, democratic forces have noted a, well, a kind of attempt of the CPSU to come into the limelight once again, and this time as quite a reactionary force. What do you, Vaino Valjas and Jaak Allik think of assessments of this kind?

[Valjas] First, events assess themselves. How the Communist Party [CP] of Estonia assesses those events has been very clearly worded in a statement. One can say but one thing: There is no justification of any kind for violence and victimization, whatever shield is used. In this connection I would like to emphasize in particular that the CP of Estonia has continuously been in touch with its Lithuanian comrades; we have given our condolences to the Lithuanian people and the Lithuanian Democratic Labor Party in the name of the CP of Estonia. [passage omitted]

[Allik] I would like to add something, since we are talking about events in the Baltics. It is indeed clear that the situation in Lithuania and Latvia—compared to ours—is substantially different. The issue is not only that there have already been shots fired over there and not here—shooting may start for a very arbitrary reason—but some objective factors are different. And it seems to me that quite a few aspects why things are different here are the result of the work of the CP of Estonia last year.

Let me give you some examples. There is no OMON [Special Purpose Militia Unit] in Estonia that has been spilling blood in both Latvia and Lithuania. And it does not exist because when those squads were set up two years ago, Marko Tobar, minister of internal affairs at the time, and Vaino Valjas, CP of Estonia leader at the time, were categorically against the setting up of such squads. Another example is that in Lithuania and Latvia the chain of events started with the fight for party property. The Jurmala party committee building was taken over in

Latvia, and publishing houses in Lithuania and Latvia were taken over. This problem has not arisen here, and I would hope that it will not arise. Our aim is to hand over party property for joint use by the people in a peaceful way, without takeovers, without soldiers. And when at the forthcoming congress the issue of the name of the CP of Estonia and of changing of it will definitely arise—numerous party members are talking about this—then it seems to me that in the present situation the congress will probably not change the name. I would like to view this as our contribution toward not providing motives of the kind that existed in Lithuania and Latvia because the activity of the CP of Estonia during the last year has proceeded not from the interests of the party itself—quite a few things could have been done differently, from which the party would have gained—but from the common interests of the Estonian people. And here there is a certain difference in our paths, too, from our companions; I mean the democratic labor parties in Lithuania and Latvia. [passage omitted]

[Valjas] Yes, you are right, the next step, to adopt a constitution, will be taken now, and from that moment the CP of Estonia will be completely independent in its affairs, it will decide for itself.

[Allik] If one answers the other half of your question, on relations with the CPSU, then indeed, starting from Sunday [27 January], hopefully, the CP of Estonia as a party will be a really independent party. [passage omitted] And it seems to me—here evidently also the question will arise of Enn-Arno Sillari's membership of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo. Well, this is another reason why the situation in Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia is different; I mean, it seems to me that the information about the situation in Estonia at the level of the CPSU leadership—and for that reason, also at the level of the soviet state leadership—about Estonia is somewhat more objective. [passage omitted] And evidently there is also a difference in that Sillari sits on the Politburo, and from Lithuania and Latvia there are Burokevicius and...

[Liivanomm and Valjas in chorus] Rubiks.

[Allik] Rubiks. Well, yes, even the name would not come to me. And the question has indeed been asked: Could Sillari resign as a sign of protest that there are such people [in the Politburo]. We all know how to protest and we have protested a lot, but one should also consider what benefit the Estonian people would derive from this. The CP of Estonia would definitely benefit from protest of this kind, and I think that as a CPSU member and having been elected at a CPSU Central Committee plenum, Sillari has both a right and a need to stay even if the CP of Estonia on the CPSU platform, led by Lembit Annus, raised at its latest plenum the issue of Annus becoming a [CPSU] Politburo member, as an official issue or proposal, so that this fight is still to come. But even if Sillari remains in the Politburo, this

will in no way mean that the CP of Estonia is organizationally tied to the CPSU. So that to answer the question—are we in the same party with those who favor force—a CP of Estonia member can say with ease that he is not. [passage omitted]

Two Women Detained in Tallinn Murder Case

LD3101172191 Stockholm Domestic Service in Swedish 1545 GMT 31 Jan 91

[Text] First about the murders of the two Swedish trade union leaders, Bertil Whinberg and Ove Fredriksson, in Tallinn, where two women have now been detained, Johan Fredriksson reports:

[Fredriksson] Well, according to (Juri Lilleman), a major in the press department of the Estonian police, two young women have been detained suspected of involvement in the murders. But, according to reports a little while ago, the women have not admitted involvement in the robbery and murder of the two Swedish trade union leaders. According to the police these are the two women who were earlier sought in connection with the murders. No more information has been given about the motives or about whether there are more suspects, but according to earlier reports it was a question of robbery and murder without any political links. A news conference has been promised for tomorrow, or presumably for Monday, by the Estonian Ministry of Internal Affairs, and then further details about the murder investigations are expected to emerge.

Baltics Groups Appeal to RSFSR, Gorbachev

LD3101194491 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 31 Jan 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Representatives of the opposition groups in the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian Supreme Soviets sent an appeal today to the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet and RSFSR People's Deputies. The appeal calls on Russian legislators to take the necessary political and legislative measures to ensure the protection of the rights and freedoms of their fellow-countrymen in the Baltic republics. An appeal has also been sent to the USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar.

The soviet of secretaries of the central committees of the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian Communist Parties also made a statement today on the events in the Baltic republics.

Baltic MD Chief Offers 'Stabilization' Proposals

PM3101154991 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 15 Jan 91 p 3

[Speech by Colonel General F.M. Kuzmin, commander of the Baltic Military District, at a roundtable meeting

with A.V. Gorbunovs, chairman of the Latvian Supreme Soviet, and representatives of various political parties and tendencies; date not given]

[Text] I have to state that the Baltic Military District is not an organization that is disturbing the situation but on the contrary one that is helping to improve it.

For the reliable and unconditional stabilization of the situation in the republic, I propose on behalf of the district's many-thousand-strong collective of military servicemen:

A return to the implementation of the USSR and Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic Constitutions and the USSR president's decrees;

The abrogation of all adopted laws that infringe on the rights and duties of servicemen, members of their families, war and labor veterans, and the so-called "Russian-speaking population";

And an end to the insulting of military servicemen—their patience is not infinite.

In this connection I protest the speeches at yesterday's rally by a number of people, including legislator Stepichev, who proposed that military servicemen be deprived of their food supply. The servicemen's almost unanimous opinion is that these "winged words" be sent with Stepichev's photograph to all soldiers' mothers on Soviet territory.

I propose that TV and radio access be given to representatives of all political tendencies and parties so that everyone, including servicemen, can express their opinion. And that for this purpose an independent control commission for the mass media be set up under the jurisdiction of the republic's parliament, of course.

We propose that the USSR Law on Compulsory Military Service be implemented, the normal work of military commissariats be ensured, the drafting of young people into the Army be carried out, and that deserters be brought back from Latvia.

The nonintroduction of airborne assault troops into Latvia today, and I repeat the word nonintroduction, is the military district's attempt to defuse the situation and help to improve it.

We propose the disbandment of the various paramilitary formations and the defense staff that was formed yesterday. I think that the Red Banner Baltic Military District Staff is sufficient for the Latvian Republic. It will resolve all questions.

I propose the implementation of measures to remove combat weapons from the population, to control all owners of hunting rifles, and to take control of weapons belonging to organs of the republic's Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] and the customs service.

It must be made the duty of organs of the Latvian Republic Prosecutor's Office and the MVD to fulfill the laws of the USSR and the president's decrees.

We servicemen assert that the MVD, under the leadership of Mr. Vaznis, is today a destabilizing force doing its utmost to confront the military department.

Communist servicemen of the Baltic Military District and other branches of the Armed Forces and other categories of troops stationed on Latvian territory—and our Communists number several tens of thousands—are absolutely incensed at the criticism leveled at the Communist Party, of which we are members. This destabilizes the situation. It must be acknowledged that such a party exists, as do Communists, that there are very many of them, and that they include soldiers.

We would like the restoration of all the social rights of servicemen and Armed Forces veterans (Comrade Godmanis has already spoken here) regarding housing construction and allocation on the basis of share participation, access to preschool and school institutions, employment for the wives of servicemen, residence permits, and other social problems.

The work of military transport must not be obstructed. You have sat down with us to discuss questions on which it is possible to find points of contact but there have already been conflicts in some places, notably at the turning to Jelgava where there was almost a bloody clash through the fault of the customs service and organs of the MVD. Thanks to an officer, a major, who kept his composure and did not resort to weapons, a conflict did not take place. This, I believe, is in all our interests.

Esteemed colleagues, I want to take advantage of the presence of such a wide audience to say that servicemen on Latvian territory are not second-class people. And whoever thinks that is profoundly mistaken.

All servicemen will defend their rights, they will stand up for their rights. But they are utterly determined to work with the Latvian people, the government, and the Supreme Soviet of the republic, political forces, organizations, and formations to find a common dialogue and ways to bring about a rapprochement of positions, to prevent bloodshed, to defuse the situation, and to live peacefully in a democratic state—the USSR.

Analyst Sees 'Compromise' Emerging in Baltics

LD3101151991 Moscow TASS in English 1505 GMT
31 Jan 91

[TASS analyst Aleksandr Mineyev]

[Text] Moscow January 31 TASS—The situation in the Baltics has stabilised somewhat after two weeks of upheavals: "Redundant" troops have been withdrawn, attempts at inside compromises have emerged and the dialogue with the centre has become more active.

However, the two past weeks decreased the chance of retaining these republics within the Soviet Union. Changes in favour of compromises indicate that the Baltic Governments have greater confidence in public support after the tragic events in Vilnius and Riga.

The leaders of the three republics, who recently flatly rejected the idea of holding a referendum on self-determination, are discussing this issue for the first time.

Lithuania scheduled the referendum for the second weekend of February, and Estonia—prior to the nationwide referendum on the future of the Union to be held on March 17.

Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev conveyed to Riga, via his envoy Rafik Nishanov, that he intends to conduct talks with the republics on the basis of the Soviet Constitution and taking into account the acts of independence adopted by their parliaments.

The polarisation of forces inside the republics is greater than between the republics and the centre. Economic difficulties aggravated by perestroika took the form of ethnic contradictions and, subsequently, as contradictions between Communists and anti-Communists.

Contradictions were multiplied by local political amateurism, on the one hand, and vestiges of chauvinistic thinking and old illusions, on the other. Experience shows that the irresponsible use of force resulting in tragedies pushes opponents further apart.

Vilnius, Tallinn and Riga failed to achieve their goals.

This is corroborated by the fact that, despite greater support from the West, their vigorous efforts in the diplomatic field did not produce adequate responses from major powers. The situation in the Baltics was not cited among the reasons for postponing the Soviet-American summit.

Meeting the Estonian leaders, the U.S. Ambassador in Moscow advised them to hold a referendum on self-determination, which would not run counter to the principle of continuity.

The trend towards a compromise is evident in Latvia's and Estonia's setting up conciliation commissions between the governments and the parliamentary majority, on the one hand, and the opposition and Russian-speaking workers at enterprises, on the other.

Lithuania, despite its tough talk with the Soviet leadership, adopted the first legislative act easing language and other infringements on the rights of national minorities.

The centre is also making efforts to ease tension. Gorbachev advised "national salvation committees" in the Baltics "to suspend their decision to take power".

Committees, in which representatives of the Russian-speaking population and Communists prevail, expect reciprocal steps from parliaments and local radical nationalist organisations.

The last people who were listed missing after the Vilnius events of January 12-13 were found, ending rumours that paratroopers had concealed the real number of killed".

However, troop patrols on Lithuanian roads and at some facilities irritate the local population and led to accidents, in which some civilians were wounded.

A compromise will evidently be reached in the foreseeable future. It is to be hoped that the authors of last year's forecasts will be wrong: they predicted that new small states would appear in Europe at the expense of reforms in the rest of the Soviet Union.

The polarisation of forces in the Baltics and the centre is mutual, and the "revolutionary" banging of doors by the Baltic republics only strengthens the position of conservatives in the country.

RSFSR

RSFSR Supreme Soviet Session 31 Jan **LD3101213591**

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian at 1848 GMT on 31 January, in its "Diary of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet" program, carries a 115-minute recorded program on the proceedings at the 31 January session of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet.

At 1849 GMT, the reporter notes that RSFSR President Boris Yeltsin made an alteration to the day's agenda at the beginning of the session. Discussion on the agenda lasted one hour.

At 1850 GMT, Deputy Tarasov asks to speak on whether the presidential decree giving the security forces the right to search property as part of the fight against economic sabotage should be ratified. Yeltsin replies that a committee would need to work on this before the Supreme Soviet could discuss it. Tarasov then asks that a committee be instructed to deal with it. Yeltsin calls for a vote on whether this should be put on the agenda. A deputy from the floor raises a procedural point on the vote. The vote is then taken. A sufficient majority is not achieved for the issue to be included on the agenda. One deputy is concerned that discussion of the agenda is taking away valuable time for discussion of the problems of the economy. He tells the deputies that, in his area, the electorate is in favor of all measures to fight economic sabotage. Another deputy is also concerned that economic issues are not being sufficiently discussed. He notes that often there is not a quorum in the Soviet of Nationalities and that this interferes with the Supreme

Soviet's work. For example, yesterday it was not possible to form a commission to study the South Ossetia problem because there was no quorum. He asks that a committee be formed today.

Deputy (Pronin) says that there is a need for political evaluation of the actions of the center. We need to disassociate ourselves from the economic reforms of the center that are causing such chaos in the country. He notes that there has been criticism of Yeltsin.

At 1905 GMT, Yeltsin comments on the appointment of General Kobets as the chairman of the State Committee for the Defense and Security of the RSFSR. He says:

"I have to inform people's deputies that yesterday the Supreme Soviet Presidium endorsed RSFSR People's Deputy Colonel General Konstantin Ivanovich Kobets in the post of chairman of the RSFSR Defense and Security Committee. You know him no doubt. You don't know him? Konstantin Ivanovich Kobets. Thus, setting up the committee will actively proceed now. Dmitriy Antonovich Volkogonov is also transferring to permanent work in the Supreme Soviet as adviser on defense and security matters. So our position here will be reinforced. In addition, now that the chairman has been approved we shall have to set up the relevant committee, and the transfer of all territorial bodies and all organizations relating to the USSR Committee for State Security [KGB] to the jurisdiction of the Russian Federation and to the subordination of this committee will now proceed, in line with the decision of our congress. As far as the views of the generals are concerned, they are not original, because not just the generals but also certain party structures have launched an energetic campaign throughout the Russian Federation to discredit the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and its chairman.

"The motives are that Yeltsin is a traitor to the Russian people of the Baltic region, and secondly the disintegration of the Union. Evidently because our information resources are very poor and an information famine is more apparent the further you get from Moscow, people don't know what the Supreme Soviet and its leadership are up to, and certain, so to speak, organizations are unscrupulously taking advantage of this to pursue this campaign. It is nothing new. It has happened in the past.

"We must evidently consolidate our position more by explaining our policies and our viewpoint and saying that, quite the reverse, we are for the Union and for the existence of the army. We in the Supreme Soviet—and we entrusted the new chairman of the committee with this yesterday—will be discussing a conception for RSFSR defense and security matters. We will discuss it and pass it at sessions of the Supreme Soviet. This won't be Yeltsin's opinion: it will be the opinion of the Supreme Soviet session. That way everything will be clear. The outlines of such a conception exist, but the committees, and specifically the RSFSR defense and security committee, still of course now have to work on it."

At 1909 GMT, Yeltsin says the Supreme Soviet will now move to discuss an appeal to the USSR Constitutional Supervision Committee and to the USSR president. He hands the floor to Deputy Shakhray, chairman of the Committee for Legislation, who speaks about the recent presidential decree on joint patrols. Shakhray says:

"First of all, the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed joint patrolling; the legal status of the joint order by the minister of internal affairs and the minister of defense; and the essence of the proposal that is put forward on behalf of the Presidium.

"First, does anyone doubt the need to intensify the fight against crime? No such deputy will probably be found. There is no doubt. Consequently, the question is: How is one to fight crime? I think that military patrols in armored personnel carriers are permissible and justified wherever criminal groups have come on to the streets carrying weapons and have seized banks, shops, and institutions. In all other cases, such a measure may have a merely psychological or political significance. Evidently, the last factor was decisive in the adoption of the given order. Was the measure brought about by the level of crime on the streets of all—I stress, all, without exception—towns in the RSFSR? It was not brought about by that. I ask that the floor should later be given to the professionals for points of information—to the acting procurator of the Russian Federation—and to send for the RSFSR minister of internal affairs, so that the professionals, with figures in their hands, can show the rate of street crime. I have some official information. Consequently, the operational situation and the state of crime in public places do not give rise to the validity of such an order in all towns without exception.

"The disadvantages of the introduction of such a document: The use of non-professionals for the fight against crime will lead to the infringement of civil rights. The absence of laws and guarantees, including social guarantees for the servicemen themselves, will lead to the infringement of the rights of those servicemen. The weapons will act as bait for those same criminal groups. In such a situation, provocation is possible on the part of various extremist groups and forces that have an interest in exacerbating the situation. Consequently, that factor may become one that sharply destabilizes the situation within the republic. Now for a legal analysis of the document. Joint patrolling with the use of armed servicemen is one of the main measures in a state-of-emergency regime. Article 11 of the RSFSR law on the legal regime of a state of emergency is the only document that envisages such a measure on the level of a law. If that is so, then the procedure, envisaged by the USSR Constitution and by the given law, for the taking of a decision on the introduction of measures that form part of the state-of-emergency regime must be observed. The procedure here is simple. Such a decision can be taken by the Supreme Soviet of the Union or by the USSR president. The mechanism for agreeing on such decisions with the Union republics is compulsory. I stress, the mechanism for agreeing—in other words, a republic may

give consent or may not give consent. Unfortunately, there is a clause in Union legislation saying that, in the absence of consent, the decision on such measures may be taken by the USSR Supreme Soviet by a two-thirds majority.

"The USSR law of 26 April on the division of powers between the USSR and the constituents of the federation has been violated. That law assigns the maintenance of public order to the joint competence of the Union and the republics, and, consequently, the taking of all decisions relating to the maintenance of public order requires joint decisions by Union bodies and the republics.

"When adopting such an order—the presidential decree of 29 January—not one Union republic was even informed that joint patrols of soldiers were being introduced on the territory of these republics and that use of weapons is allowed during these patrols.

"The same decree violates a number of articles of the USSR Constitution and the legislation of the Russian Federation, in particular the decision by the RSFSR Congress, the first congress, on the demarcation of functions. In this we wrote that the RSFSR Ministry of Internal Affairs cooperates with the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, but is not directly subordinate to it.

"The final part of my speech. What conclusions can be drawn from the given situation? There are three ways of acting, the possible reactions by the Supreme Soviet to this situation.

"First, not to pay attention, as if nothing had happened. Everything is proceeding normally. The second possibility: To immediately halt the validity of the given order. By the way, according to the RSFSR Constitution adopted before the declaration of independence, before the declaration of Russia's state sovereignty, in Article 109 there is a point which gives the Supreme Soviet the right to halt acts of USSR ministries and departments. Thus the second possibility is to halt this order.

"Finally, there is a third possibility: to try to choose a way not of head-on confrontation, but a way of seeking accord, an agreement with the Union leadership.

"The Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet offers for your attention the third path. What is its essence? Firstly, an appeal from the Supreme Soviet to the USSR Committee of Constitutional Supervision. You have the draft. This appeal has been formulated thus: to make a decision on the constitutionality of legislative acts directly or indirectly allowing the use of armed soldiers of the Soviet Army and Navy to maintain public order and issued in violation of the constitutional procedure for deciding such questions.

"The second document: to appeal to adopt the appropriate resolution and appeal to the USSR president with the proposal. Two points: First, to propose that he halt the validity of the order indicated until the Committee of

Constitutional Supervision produces its conclusion, so as to then make a final decision. Second, to propose that the USSR president—as is envisaged by USSR and RSFSR legislation—agree upon extraordinary measures with the leadership of the Union republics, with the highest bodies of authority in the Union republics.

"I would also instruct the RSFSR minister of internal affairs, until he receives a reply from the president, with the agreement of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, to instruct local soviets to decide this question in every individual town. Certainly there are in places situations that are no longer tolerable, and it is necessary to use the Armed Forces. I want to stress that we are not talking about this being absolutely impermissible; we are saying that for this there have to be weighty reasons and legal procedure has to be observed so this does not appear to be arbitrariness.

"I support this third way, the two appeals to the president and the Committee of Constitutional Supervision, and if there is no reaction we can return to this issue at the session, or instruct the Council of Ministers—they also have the right to do this—to react in the appropriate way to the joint order.

"It seems to me that the way of head-on confrontation just now [changes thought]...in the first place head-on confrontation can never have purely positive processes, and now we also need to bear in mind the situation that has arisen and the actual disposition of forces.

That's all. Thank you."

Yeltsin then calls for questions to Shakhray from the floor. One deputy notes that the electorate is concerned about disorder, but also about the lack of action by the authorities. He notes the number of unsolved crimes. He says the RSFSR Supreme Soviet loses authority by objecting to such measures being taken against crimes. Yeltsin interrupts to say this is not a question and that measures are being studied at present by the RSFSR to be presented to the Supreme Soviet. Shakhray says that a soldier is a soldier, not a policeman, and that joint patrols only stop street crime.

Deputy Volkogonov then speaks, urging support for Shakhray. He says:

"Esteemed Boris Nikolayevich [Yeltsin], I think we must support the proposals tabled by Deputy Shakhray. They are calm, constructive, and acceptable. The Left Center group and a whole series of other deputies' groups propose that we agree to them. But I'd like to make one remark. We should realize perfectly clearly at the moment that we all find ourselves at a watershed and everyone must be aware of the full extent of our responsibility. A totalitarian society differs from a civil society in that it has a concentration of power. Today we can increasingly frequently sense and see this concentration of power. And conversely...I'm going to reply in a moment...I'll come to my question. The previous speaker had his say, and I also want to say a few words:

a civil society values only freedom and the guarantees of it. And we are in essence on the threshold of perhaps following the Polish way. If we now agree to this, there will be 10-12 years of terrible stagnation, after which we'll unfailingly go back to democracy. The mill-wheels of history grind slowly, but ineluctably. Nothing can be stopped. So I believe that we must go for a compromise in the following way. We should agree to patrols where the soviets agree to them—town and oblast soviets and so on, where there is some vital need for them: incidents of crimes and so on. We should only agree to patrols when the soviets give their consent. In all other cases I think we must back the proposals and the approach to the Constitutional Supervision Committee and to the president. For in a number of cases the patrols will simply be provocative. Thank you."

At 1923 GMT, Yeltsin comments on the joint patrols. He says:

"We have received the official decision of the Moscow City Soviet, which is categorically against the introduction of joint patrols in Moscow, especially with infantry fighting vehicles. Joint patrols are an insult to Muscovites. If a decision is not made to stop such joint patrols, then Muscovites are prepared to commit civil disobedience."

"We have received an official appeal—the decision of the Moscow City Soviet—to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. It reads: Please adopt a decision and explain how we are to act."

An unidentified deputy asks for figures concerning crime. He says that crime has increased. Shakhray says that joint patrols will not help reduce these figures. Deputy Pogorelov says that the Supreme Soviet is being indecisive. He talks about the danger of 18-year-olds with submachine guns on the streets.

Shakhray says that as long as the Supreme Soviet does not have full power over its authorities, then it is not possible to do everything they would like. The mass media is not in our hands and is often critical. We need to make compromises with the Union in order to retain our authority.

Deputy Yerevin says confrontation with the center and speaking against the decree does not help solve crime. We need measures now. Another deputy says that by reacting calmly to this decree, we let our army be appraised in the same light as it was in Afghanistan. The mothers of those who fought in Afghanistan will not want their sons to participate in such patrols.

Deputy (Chaiykovskiy) says that confrontation with the center and revision of all its decisions is detrimental to Russia. He notes incidents where the Army has been most helpful in keeping order, and says the population knows this. Shakhray says that this deputy has shown some of the positive aspects of the decree, but that the decree is to be universally applied, and this is wrong. We are not confronting the center now. An unnamed deputy

asks who will defend the people's deputies. A crowd always surrounds the Rossiya Hotel and people's deputies are insulted for their views. At 1936 GMT, Shakhray says that he understands this, but asks whether armed soldiers is the answer.

At 1937 GMT, a deputy on the podium asks other deputies to look at the presidential decree as he comments on it. He says: Yes, there is a rise in crime. What are the measures to be taken? He says that bad military commanders should be removed. Military discipline is to be introduced. Does this mean that we are to march and salute on the streets? When mass demonstrations are to be held, soldiers are to be issued live ammunition. Why? Often provocations take place during a demonstration, especially when there are 18-year-olds with weapons. He says that this is a situation where the people and the Army are in confrontation. There is a need for reason and common sense.

At 1943 GMT, a vote is taken on whether to send an appeal. Deputies vote in favor. Yeltsin announces that the Presidium voted in favor of appealing to the constitutional control committee. Shakhray, now speaking from the floor, reads out points of a draft decision on measures to reduce crime. An unnamed deputy proposes that an addition be made to the appeal to the committee. Deputies vote to have a roll vote on adopting a draft decision as a basis for the appeal. Another deputy proposes further amendments to the draft decision. Yeltsin says that the supervision committee works slowly, so the president is to be asked to halt the validity of the decree until a decision is made.

Shakhray says that the deputies should note that there are two appeals: one to the supervision committee and one to the president, so there should be two votes. A vote adopts a draft resolution for both appeals.

At 1953 GMT, the relay of the afternoon session begins. A reporter says that the deputies adopted a final version of the appeals, after working on them.

Deputy Khasbulatov begins to talk about the results of the republican Congress of People's Deputies. He says that the record of the congress must be closely examined and analyzed. He mentions some of the work which went on before the congress began. He notes, for example, some of the novelties the computer voting system involved. The Soviet of Ministers was not able to reply within three days to deputies' questions as it is required to do. He says this must be improved. He gives figures for the number of deputies present and voting at the sessions of the congress. He says that it is necessary to draw lessons from the experience of the congress. Proposals for improvements should be made. It is necessary to draw up a schedule for drafting laws. He says that it would be desirable for some committees to work in the Kremlin, the center of Russia. This issue is being examined.

Yeltsin then asks for questions to Khasbulatov. A female deputy asks about implementation of congress decisions

on health and education. She also asks if he does not think that the legislature is often just a place for a lot of talk. She says that the Supreme Soviet is a legislative body and should act as such. Khasbulatov says that control is to be effected over the implementation of the congress's decisions. He says that there have been instances of the Supreme Soviet being used for just talk, with "professional" politicians appearing. This is trying to be avoided.

Another deputy asks what has been done by the government and Council of Ministers to implement the decisions adopted by the congress. Khasbulatov says that more needs to be done in this direction.

Deputy (Sannikov) asks about the need for additional measures to help the countryside. He asks about the priority of the countryside. Khasbulatov says that the countryside is important and there is a need for prioritization. This must be worked on by the Supreme Soviet.

At 2026 GMT, the relay of the evening session begins. Yeltsin is no longer in the chair. An unidentified chairman asks for discussion from the floor on a draft resolution concerning the report by Khasbulatov. Various amendments are proposed and voted on by deputies. A female deputy suggests a vote on the inclusion of an extra point on agrarian issues. This passes. She calls for a Presidium meeting to be convened to discuss agriculture. A vote on the decision "as a whole" is passed.

The recorded relay ends at 2043 GMT.

Joint Patrols Set To Begin in Moscow

LD0102144591 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1200 GMT 1 Feb 91

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] In 55 minutes, the official briefing for the Army patrols that, together with the militia, have been ordered to maintain order in the streets will start in Moscow. The Yazov-Pugo order applies to the whole of the country's territory. But the legislatures of Moldova, Georgia, and the Baltic republics have decided not to ratify that decision of the center. Yesterday, the Russian legislature requested the Constitutional Supervision Committee to carry out a special assessment, and requested the USSR president to suspend its validity for the time being. So far there has been no official reaction from the president to the appeal, so that the patrolling will evidently become a reality.

Either way, it is important that all citizens should display understanding of the new situation and know their rights and the possible actions of the patrols. We hope that this will be described in greater detail by Lieutenant General Nikolay Smirnov, the military commandant of Moscow, who has agreed to visit the television news service studio during our evening bulletin for Europe.

Legislature Adopts Appeal

LD3101130791 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 31 Jan 91

[Report by correspondent Aleksandr Ruvinskiy from the House of Soviets in Moscow]

[Excerpts] [Ruvinskiy] Today the Russian Soviet Federated Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet held a joint sitting of the chambers. The morning session considered only one question which dealt with appeals to the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee and to the USSR president. The RSFSR Supreme Soviet has just adopted these appeals on the recent order by the USSR minister of internal affairs and the USSR minister of defense introducing joint militia on Soviet Army patrols in cities. I must say that the discussion on these two documents lasted a long time but they were both adopted as a result of the vote.

[Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian at 1200 GMT on 31 January in its "Television News Service" program adds the following on the RSFSR Supreme Soviet's adoption of appeals on the joint patrols: "The resolution on the unilateral abrogation of the Army patrolling the streets of Russian towns was not passed as a result of the vote which has just taken place in the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. The more moderate position supported by Boris Yeltsin was victorious. The sense of the two resolutions of the Russian parliament is this: to appeal to the USSR Constitution Oversight Committee to carry out an expert examination of the Yazov-Pugo order in order to clarify how lawful it is; and to call on the USSR president to postpone the operation of the order and not to allow Army patrols to go out into the towns until the Constitutional Oversight Committee announces its verdict."]

The Russian Federation Supreme Soviet appeal asks the Constitutional Oversight Committee to make a ruling on whether the acts under the law are constitutional as they either directly or indirectly allow the use of Soviet Army and Navy servicemen for the protection of public order. They have also been issued in violation of the constitutional procedure for tackling this kind of question.

The appeal to the USSR president contains a proposal to suspend this joint order until the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee makes a proper ruling. It also contains a proposal to the USSR president to use the mechanism for coordinating the measures envisaged under a state of emergency with the union republic supreme bodies of state power in accordance with the USSR Constitution and the USSR law on the legal conditions of a state of emergency. Unfortunately, this time it has not been observed and has become a cause of the conflict between two bodies of power. [passage omitted]

Presidium Rejects Armed Forces Use

PM0102094791 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 31 Jan 91 First Edition p 2

["RSFSR Council of Ministers Presidium Statement"—SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA headline]

[Text] The RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers Presidium voices serious concern at the actions of Union organs connected with the use of the Armed Forces to fulfill functions uncharacteristic of them.

Interference by the Armed Forces in civilian conflicts—without the consent, moreover, of the republics' constitutional organs of power—has already shown the whole danger and hopelessness of such a policy. In this context particular alarm is aroused by the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs and USSR Ministry of Defense Order No. 493/513 of 29 December 1990, which for a long time was kept secret not only from the public but also from the Union republics, and which obliges district commanders, garrison chiefs, and commanding officers of units and combined units "to implement measures to strengthen the maintenance of public order and to combat infringements of the law in the streets and other public places."

The measures announced in the order to ensure public order are consonant with a response to conditions of a state of emergency. However, the USSR Law "On the Legal Regime of a State of Emergency" laid down that the latter is declared by the republics' supreme organs of state power only by the USSR president at the request of these organs only, when there are natural disasters, major accidents or catastrophes, epidemics, epizootics, and also mass riots in individual localities; or, in the absence of a request from them or their consent, by the USSR president himself, with the decision adopted by him being submitted without delay to the USSR Supreme Soviet for approval. These grounds are absent at present on the territory of the Russian Federation.

The desire of the order's authors to circumvent the USSR Constitution and the basic military laws and to exceed their official powers is noticeable. All this is a gross violation of human rights and of the state sovereignty of the subjects of the federation. Moreover, such actions could provoke or increase the destabilization of the sociopolitical situation.

The RSFSR Council of Ministers Presidium voices a resolute protest against such actions and demands that the USSR Cabinet of Ministers take the necessary measures to halt the anticonstitutional actions of the union ministries.

For its part the RSFSR Council of Ministers Presidium emphasizes its determination to take all measures provided for in law to strengthen law and order and to stabilize the sociopolitical situation in society.

Yeltsin on Opposition to Patrols

LD3101223691 Moscow Central Television First
Program Network in Russian 2100 GMT 31 Jan 91

[Interview with Boris Yeltsin, president of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, by unidentified correspondent in Moscow on 31 January—recorded]

[Text] [Correspondent] Tell me, Boris Nikolayevich, how do you feel about the fact that the Army will now be involved in maintaining public order?

[Yeltsin] Negatively. The Army has never been prepared for this, either from the point of view of the training of the soldiers or from the point of view of the equipment they have. So this does pose a danger of some sort of accidental clashes. Then it also has a psychological effect on people. And even more the armored personnel carriers, machineguns, all that creates an unfavorable atmosphere. All you need is a small explosion, and then of course events will begin that are very undesirable indeed. Therefore today the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation adopted an appeal to the Committee of Constitutional Supervision, considering this to be an unconstitutional order and decree, and it also made—the Supreme Soviet—official representations to the president, asking him to cancel the decree and forbid its operation.

[Correspondent] Tell me, as I understand it, no one consulted you on this?

[Yeltsin] Absolutely. Although under the Constitution, such matters are supposed to be agreed, obligatorily, with each Supreme Soviet and each republic.

Deputies Call for Gorbachev, Pavlov Resignation

LD3101191191 Moscow TASS in English 1856 GMT
31 Jan 91

[By TASS legislative correspondents]

[Text] Moscow January 31 TASS—Russian parliamentarians charged today that most of the decisions of the Second Extraordinary Congress of Russian People's Deputies, primarily on agrarian issues, were not being fulfilled.

The programme to revive the Russian countryside was central to the second congress held late last year. During the discussion of this programme, deputies decided to institute private land ownership in the republic.

Delivering a report to parliament, first Vice-President of the Russian Federation Ruslan Khasbulatov called for greater determination in upholding one's rights. Most deputies see the key reason decisions of the second congress are unfulfilled in the shortage of funds, material and technical resources.

A document adopted after discussion of this issue calls upon Soviet of all levels "to ensure the unqualified fulfillment" of the congress's decisions. Deputies asked Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Agriculture and Food Gennadiy Kulik to report on the implementation of the congress's decision on agrarian issues.

At the close of this evening's session, Deputy Mikhail Chelnokov read a statement, signed by 82 Russian people's deputies. The statement emphasises "the principled impossibility" of further cooperation with the Union leadership in governing the country.

The group demanded the resignation of President Mikhail Gorbachev, Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov and "all of their team".

The deputies called for abolishing the executive presidency structure in the USSR and transferring absolute power to republics as represented by the Coordinating Council of their leaders. They said their demands were provoked by the Union leadership's moves aimed against the people.

The statement failed to draw a reaction—positive or negative—in the hall.

Russian Prime Minister Ivan Silayev will deliver a report on the results of economic and social development of Russia in 1990, on the performance of the republican economy and its budget and pricing policy in the current year at Friday's session of parliament.

Silayev To Present Budget, Pricing Policy

LD0102093591 Moscow TASS in English 0804 GMT
1 Feb 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow February 1 TASS—On behalf of the Russian Federation parliament, Vladimir Isakov, speaker of the Council of the Republic, congratulated parliament President Boris Yeltsin on his 60th birthday at the plenary session that began here today.

Russian Federation Prime Minister Ivan Silayev is expected to deliver a report at the session today on Russia's economic and social development in 1990 and the functioning of the republic's economy, its budget and pricing policy in the current year.

Moscow Forms Commission on Military Issues

LD0102112291 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1000 GMT 1 Feb 91

[Text] A commission on military issues and emergency situations has been set up in the Moscow City Soviet, a TASS correspondent reports. In particular, it will liaise with the command and personnel of military units stationed in the capital and in Moscow Oblast. A decision on this was adopted at the Moscow City Soviet session.

Spokesman Notes Interrepublic Agreement Progress

LD0102144491 Moscow TASS in English 1411 GMT
1 Feb 91

[By TASS correspondent Boris Zverev]

[Text] Moscow February 1 TASS—Gennadiy Burbulis, a Russian presidential spokesman, said here today that working groups of the Ukraine, Belorussia, Kazakhstan and Russia would meet in Moscow on Monday to draft a quadripartite agreement.

Speaking at an all-Russian meeting of newspaper editors in Moscow today, he said the document, which has yet to be named, confirms "The stability of horizontal relations between republics".

Burbulis emphasised that the agreement sums up the current stage of bilateral agreements between Soviet republics. A multilateral agreement is needed today, Burbulis said adding that the interrepublican negotiating process "Provides for the formation of a new union".

Democratic Party Head on Prospects of New Union

LD3101131291 Moscow Central Television First
Program Network in Russian 1200 GMT 31 Jan 91

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] The fate of the country is of concern to other political parties, too. Here is the forecast given by Nikolay Travkin, chairman of the Democratic Party of Russia.

[Begin Travkin recording] The quadrilateral treaty between Belorussia, Kazakhstan, Ukraine, and Russia has been signed. It is an economic treaty but it will turn into a political one, too. The republics will join together, and a union which is new in quality will be born. It may be that there will not be 15; perhaps it will have 13 or 12 republics. However, it will be a qualitatively new community based on their interests. We shall visit each other without showing visas at the border.

Democrats should also help this process to take place and not slow it down by setting just the aim of disintegration. [end recording]

Kabardino-Balkaria ASSR Proclaims Sovereignty

LD3101181991 Moscow TASS in English 1804 GMT
31 Jan 91

[Text] Nalchik January 31 TASS—The heated debate at the session of the Supreme Soviet of the Kabardino-Balkar Autonomous Republic resulted in the adoption of a declaration of sovereignty, proclaiming that Kabardino-Balkaria will no longer be an autonomous, but a fully-fledged Soviet Socialist Republic, a sovereign multi-national state within the framework of the Russian Federation and the Soviet Union.

The parliament also proclaimed supremacy of the Kabardino-Balkar Constitution and laws on its territory. Land, natural resources, economic potential and cultural and historical values are proclaimed to be the republican people's property. The Kabardin, Balkar and Russian languages are recognised as equal.

Trade Unions, Russian Government Sign Accord

LD3101131991 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1200 GMT 31 Jan 91

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] The independent trade unions have signed an agreement with the government of Russia. It does not include points on employment or increasing incomes in line with inflation.

Correspondent Examines RSFSR Legislature Actions

LD2901195691 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 29 Jan 91

[From the "RSFSR Supreme Soviet Diary" program presented by Vera Shchelkunova]

[Excerpts] I called today's diary: Lines of a Portrait of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet. One of these lines was shown most clearly in the first days of this session when a very fundamental decision could have been taken determining Russia's attitude to the tragedy in the Baltics. The decision was not adopted. Commentators in our press and the foreign press are struggling over the riddle that perhaps Yeltsin does not have such strong support in the Supreme Soviet as we thought. Perhaps the communists are still holding the leading positions, submitting to party discipline and are again organizing a campaign against the fallen angel. Perhaps it is just that the three-day action to exchange banknotes has played its role. Our correspondent decided to ask Stanislav Shustov, secretary of the committee for human rights, his opinions on this.

[Begin recording] [Correspondent] Stanislav Pavlovich, what do you think of the situation which has now arisen in the Supreme Soviet? It would seem that the Supreme Soviet is discussing questions connected with the defense of human rights but the Supreme Soviet is voting against such documents. What is happening? What is going on?

[Shustov] well, where did everything start? From the critical situation in the country as a whole and in the Baltic area in particular, Boris Nikolayevich's flight to the Baltic and his attempt to resolve these problems. After this, naturally, it was necessary to get the support of the Supreme Soviet to resolve this question. All the more so since about 300 deputies raised the question of convening an extraordinary session. Unfortunately, not all of the 300 are members of the Supreme Soviet—they are peoples' deputies who are normally present at the congress and do not have voting rights in the Supreme

Soviet—they were worried about the situation in the country and supposed that if everything that Boris Nikolayevich did in the Baltics was confirmed by a Supreme Soviet decision this would help to resolve the issue more rapidly by peaceful means on the basis of treaties and so on.

However, then the monetary exchange started, people were given three days, and a vast number of deputies—well you must understand these people's human feelings—departed. About 37 people were absent from the session.

Moreover, I would like to say that I felt bad and ashamed for those deputies who actively spoke out on the side of the communists, actively proposed some changes in the draft but when it came to the vote—a named vote—just hid themselves away. I would like to name just three names, to appeal to the electorate. There is Chaykovskiy who is always speaking as a representative of Kaliningrad Oblast. There is Ramadan Abdulatipov and Babulin who is also known to the whole country. [passage omitted]

[Correspondent] On Wednesday at separate meetings of the chambers the deputies intend to return to the decision on the situation in the country in connection with the situation in the Baltics. [end recording]

Silayev Meets With Peasant Farmers

LD3001135191 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1200 GMT 30 Jan 91

[Text] Ivan Silayev, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Council of Ministers, has met with a group of peasant leaseholders on the eve of the Congress of Russian Farmers, which is to be held in Moscow on 2-3 February. The issues of setting up and developing peasant farming were discussed. At the meeting it was stated that tens of thousands of peasant farmers, together with state farms and collective farms, are capable of feeding Russia. In order to create such a number of peasant farmers, it is important in the first place to provide those who are interested with allotments of land, agricultural equipment, building materials, and also, to offer them financial credit without impediment. The essential problems, it is true to say, are both guarantees and legal protection for the farmers. However, as participants in the meeting reported, aiming for independence often not only encounters a lack of encouragement, but also encounters passive hostility which artificially slows it down in the localities.

Moscow City Executive Committee Team Elected

PM2901111591 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jan 91 p 1

[Report by V. Tairov: "Moscow City Soviet Executive Committee Chairman's 'Cabinet'"]

[Text] The Moscow City Soviet Executive Committee [Mosgorispolkom] chairman's 'cabinet' has at last been elected after a wait of over eight months and heated parliamentary debate.

As is known, the events in Lithuania altered the second session's standing orders [reglament] so yesterday's sitting began with those events. The day before, the editorial commission had been instructed to prepare a draft decision "On the situation in the Baltic area and measures to prevent emergency situations in Moscow." However, true to form and "alternatively minded" as ever, some of the deputies, instead of discussing the draft, decided to continue the debate, which gave deputy A. Muza reason to declare, in a fit of pique: We are a city soviet session here, not a UN assembly.

Peace was restored by the chairman's proposal that they should hear the deputies who had been to Lithuania. G. Zulumyan, L. Kolosov, V. Borshchev, and V. Dayneke spoke. Then the draft decision was sent for finalization—in order to take into account the impressions and opinions brought back from the trip to Lithuania. Nonetheless, some people were not satisfied with the document even when amended. The debate was launched again.

It is paradoxical, but a fact, that the very important question of the election of Mosgorispolkom members, which had been nowhere near a solution, was brought to a logical conclusion with unprecedented dispatch during the breaks between the chaotic counts of votes on the resolution on events in Lithuania. Some realistically minded deputies managed to get to the microphone and demanded an immediate, roll-call vote, for Yu. Luzhkov's team. The demand was accepted and the executive committee was elected by a majority (248 votes "for," 85 "against," with some abstentions).

So V.A. Karnaukhov, V.A. Korobchenko, and I.N. Ordzhonikidze were elected first deputy chairmen; A.I. Voronin, A.S. Matrosov, A.I. Muzykantskiy, A.M. Peshkov, O.G. Popov, and V.I. Resin were elected deputy chairmen, and N.P. Shevelkin, I.M. Antipov, Ye.I. Bystrov, A.M. Tarasov, A.M. Vladislavlev, and A.D. Ioffe were elected executive committee members. The editorial board congratulates them and wishes them successful work for the good of the city.

RSFSR 'Rubles for Dollars' Deal Explained

91UF0391A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 26 Jan 91 First Edition p 2

[Article by N. Garifullina under the rubric "Notes of a Commentator on the Session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet": "Billions in Rubles and Dollars"]

[Text] Judging by the telephone calls and telegrams arriving at the editorial office, after the first day of the session of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet the voters are feeling disappointment. Indeed, the very same opinion is held

by many people's deputies, and one of them in a reply at the microphone even said that the public opinion rating of the legislature is beginning to drop. And the problem is not even that, as before, some of the people's representatives are painfully short on the political and even elementary skills of conducting a discussion. There is a populist strain: Instead of involving themselves in earnest with Russian problems, it is simpler after all to again seek out the image of the enemy in the person of the Union center, heap all the blame on it, and look for further confrontation. Deputies who think realistically cannot accept such a practice. Not without reason did V.P. Lisin, member of the "Russia" deputy group, protest to the presidium that the first day of the session was inconclusive, the large assembly of deputies turned into a rally, and the authority of a thoughtful and responsible legislature has been undermined by rash and provocative speeches.

However, the second day of the session also left that same feeling of dissatisfaction. Yesterday before the beginning of the meeting the deputies received two draft decrees on the report given on Monday by B.N. Yeltsin. I will remind you that despite two repeat votes, the draft decree proposed by the Presidium was not assumed as a basis at that time. Now two drafts were proposed on that same question—"On the Political Situation in the RSFSR" and "On Immediate Measures to Stabilize the Political Situation Existing as a Result of Events in the Baltic Republics." A conciliation committee was created which was charged with considering the alternative drafts of the deputy groups. On Monday, as the reader will remember, the alternative drafts "were not considered."

So, there has been movement, though not much of it. While the commission worked on the draft decree, the deputies listened to I.S. Silayev, chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, on measures planned by the administration to implement the edict of the USSR president and the decree of the Union Cabinet of Ministers on the exchange of 50-ruble and 100-ruble notes.

Later an unexpected subject came to the forefront of the session. As part of the "warm-up" proper, Deputy Yerminev asked for an explanation of some multibillion-ruble transaction that involved G.I. Filshin, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, according to a segment broadcast the evening before on the show "Vremya." Inasmuch as there was an article on this in yesterday's issue of SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA entitled "Rubles for Dollars," I believe it will be of interest to the readers to learn a few details of the "transaction of the century," as it has already been christened by the deputies in the corridors.

At the end of the morning meeting G.I. Filshin took the floor and read aloud, as he put it, "what he had written and on the basis of which documents he had written it." Here I want to let my dictaphone do the work:

G. I. Filshin: "To Mr. C. Gibbons, president of the firm Dow Trading International. The RSFSR Council of Ministers will render cooperation and support in the execution of a contract between your firm and the association Rebirth of the Urals Countryside through a channeling of credit with subsequent reinvestment of Soviet rubles received by foreign firms in various sectors of the RSFSR national economy, with the goal of providing the population with goods of prime necessity." On the basis of what and in what fashion did I write such a note?

A group of deputies and ministers of trade came to me on 11 January and suggested or spoke in favor of the following statement signed by the president of the association of Rebirth of the Urals Countryside and the president of the firm. I will read it aloud to you as well so that you will know everything precisely:

"An independent group of enterprises in the person of the president of the association Rebirth of the Urals Countryside, supported by the executive committees of the Chelyabinsk and Kurgan Oblast Soviets, requests permission to attract private foreign capital in order to saturate the market in various regions of the RSFSR with food, consumer goods, technology, and equipment through the acquisition of a great quantity of commodities from abroad as well as through the investment and reinvestment of money in rubles received by our foreign partners in the national economy of Russia by way of mutual advance currency settlements and using a portion of the accumulated money for charitable goals. The mutual credits may be carried out in accordance with an agreement between the British firm and the intersectoral association Rebirth of the Urals Countryside. The firm guarantees that the hard-currency credits of the clients whose interests it represents are untainted and it guarantees representation of the necessary documents for carrying out (indistinguishable word) at the first demand. The primary client in this transaction will be the RSFSR Ministry of Trade; V.A. Kozlov, deputy minister of trade, has provided his agreement in this matter."

Further on is a guarantee that all this will take place without any direct exchange of any hard currency. The president, C. Gibbons, has written the appropriate letter. It is also short, and I will read it aloud so that you have all the information. Aside from these three letters I was presented a list of goods, including 700,000 tons of meat, 300,000 tons of butter, etc. All this served as the basis for my support of this transaction. There was no question of any exchange of rubles for dollars in this matter. I wish to point out that several of the deputies are present in this auditorium. And so I would like to read this very short letter. What does it guarantee?

"We affirm to the Ministry of Trade our readiness to deliver food, clothing, consumer goods, and technology to speed up production of these goods in such sectors as agriculture, machinery construction, the mining

industry, production of electrical appliances, power engineering, the construction of hotels, and tourism, and we also affirm that we, the company, are also ready, willing, and able to deliver needed goods and render services by the appropriate organizations within contractual parameters for times and places during the course of 1991. Depending on the volumes of deliveries to the RSFSR of food and consumer goods—I would like to stress this—the company proposes to deliver goods directly from their factory producers and to guarantee the highest quality at the minimum price. And, when possible, we will try to arrange barter transactions in order to allow the RSFSR to keep its hard currency. Incidentally, significant volumes of deliveries to the RSFSR will automatically present an opportunity to substantially add to the trade discount on the delivery and transportation of consumer goods and food.

"We guarantee that the RSFSR Ministry of Trade will monitor deliveries and carry out selection of goods. We propose to organize trade missions of personnel of the RSFSR Ministry of Trade to the farms and factories of those countries where, in our view, the best goods for Russia may be found. Sincerely yours, Colin Gibbons, president."

Afterward G.I. Filshin informed the deputies that he was given a list of those goods and the volumes that were ready to be delivered. He did not see or sign any other documents.

G.I. Filshin reported that this firm indicated precisely that the first delivery would go to Komi, then to Chelyabinsk, then to other cities, and if there is opposition to a bargain, they will be left out of the transaction.

Gennadiy Innokentyevich ended his speech this way: "I believe that we need to respond by figuring out why people are trying to interrupt our activities in this direction this way. That is all that I can say."

"Well, do we let him off the hook?" asked B.N. Yeltsin, acting as chairman.

Deputy V. Tikhomirov, who was apparently satisfied with the explanation of G.I. Filshin, immediately proposed that Central Television be required to broadcast a response on the show "Vremya" to yesterday's report concerning "the story about the billions" and that G.I. Filshin's news conference be shown widely. "Because,"—I am again turning on the dictaphone—"at the level of falsehood that Central Television is presently maintaining, they will still end up painting it over, camouflaging it, and presenting it in any fashion that suits them."

"We must register a protest, not just an explanation," agreed Boris Nikolayevich, and he proposed that they vote "to demand of the 'Vremya' program an appropriate statement by Gennadiy Innokentyevich Filshin, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, on this issue."

However, the deputies protested in such great numbers that he was compelled to give the floor to the "micro-phones."

Deputy V.A. Serdyukov reminded G.I. Filshin that he had said on three occasions, speaking in the Supreme Soviet, that the question of permitting foreign firms to invest rubles earned from the sale of consumer goods and food should be decided by the Supreme Soviet or a session of the Supreme Soviet. Why then had he himself made the decision to grant foreign firms the right to invest, thus circumventing the Supreme Soviet?

G.I. Filshin: I would like to say the following: I made the decision on the reinvestment of Soviet rubles in accordance with Union and republic legislation requiring us to concur. But that is not the main point: The main point is that in this instance the administration did not act as either a guarantor or a mediator of this transaction... In this instance the administration as represented by me, or more accurately I personally, I take upon myself this responsibility. It is simply a matter of rendering assistance in the realization of relations between the private firms Association for the Rebirth of the Urals Countryside and Dow Trading International. If we had acted as we have for previous transactions, which have been large-scale transactions up until now—if we had brought it to the Supreme Soviet unapproved—then the administration would have acted as one of the parties. In that case I would have been obliged to agree with you. In this instance we are simply rendering assistance. As for any decisions on investments, they are being made by the local organs and the appropriate departments which oversee these projects.

Answering a question concerning our obligations, guarantees, and the amount of money involved in the transaction, G.I. Filshin responded:

"...it is a multiyear transaction, one that is for a series of years. How are we supposed to pay for it? According to the scenario I gave you in my preliminary report. According to agreements with local organs, for example with Chelyabinsk and Kurgan Oblasts and the Komi ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic]. When we were talking with Komi, we suggested that they take this scenario and find... By the way, it was a question of those oil fields that are substandard. Therefore, one moment, this is about Komi and not that other transaction; please keep in mind, it is a completely different transaction which still has not been concluded. But I would like to say the following. According to the agreement, compensation was proposed using a portion of the output which will be produced at new capacities built through the investment of rubles and hard currency on the part of that firm... In essence it is a question of the two organizations which organize a single company carrying out sales and investment and finally foreign exchange compensation through the sale of a portion of the output produced at the new capacities. As for what portion, that should be agreed upon in accordance with the law."

Deputy V.N. Lyubimov asks:

"Gennadiy Innokentyevich, permit me two questions. First, when you were speaking you said that you are acting on your own behalf and that the administration has nothing to do with it. In conjunction with this I would like to ask what amounts of money members of the administration, members of the cabinet, and Ivan Stepanovich Silayev, who heads the Council of Ministers, have the right to put their signatures on. Is there an upper limit to these sums, and will we not find at some point 140 billion, half of the budget, signed off by one of the members of the administration."

"And the second question. I should mention that it follows from your words. Let me put the question this way. Additional sums of money may be received for products produced over and above the plan such as oil, timber, and whatever else has hard-currency value. In conjunction with this, why should there not be a plundering of nonrenewable resources?"

G.I. Filshin: I would like to say, comrades, that what I have signed is a transfer of credits. What does that mean? It means that on both sides mutual credits are allotted for conducting certain transactions. The amounts are determined by the scale of the transactions. Therefore, if the scale of the transactions is determined by these sales and the quantity of money which is earned, this is just what credit interactions are all about. The amount that one party or the other sets forth on the credit accounts is also determined in accordance with the agreement.

Now for the second question. It concerns why the administration favors this type of interaction over credits. We simply eat through credits. In this case assets received for Soviet rubles are invested in production and only a portion of this production is taken out. In other words, this is oriented toward increasing our export resources and not shrinking them. True, we will be going through our resources. But what alternatives do we have? I would like to hear an alternative...

In short, the deputies had many questions: The situation is genuinely out of the ordinary and resembles a puzzle. V.P. Gerasimov, chairman of the Kurgan Oblast Soviet, focussed attention on one of the pieces.

V.P. Gerasimov: Inasmuch as there was a reference, as I understood it, to the Soviet Executive Committees of Chelyabinsk and Kurgan Oblasts, I would like to know what kind of association this is: Rebirth of the Urals Countryside—that is the first thing! (Noise, animation.) I am speaking sincerely.

And second. Is there any document that I signed asking for such transactions. (Noise.)

I did not ask for them, and it is written here that I understood: Do not try to drown me out, I know who you are that are always trying to pressure me! An action group of enterprises represented by the president of the

Intersectoral (that is what you probably read?) Association for the Rebirth of the Urals Countryside, supported by the Soviet Executive Committees of the Oblast Soviets of Chelyabinsk and Kurgan Oblasts—I say once more that I never signed such a document. Maybe earlier, when I was not chairman of the soviet, someone signed a similar document. But I have been chairman of the soviet and of its executive committee simultaneously for two months, and I never signed such a document...

S.N. Baburin raised a question: "Gennadiy Innokentyevich made a mistake in saying that during his negotiations with representatives of the firm there were people's deputies in attendance who are now in the auditorium. Before this commission is created, I request that the names of those deputies who acted as mediators of this transaction be given."

G.I. Filshin: Valeriy Innokentyevich Ikonnikov and Comrade Sviridov—he is also a deputy. Please forgive me, I should have looked around at that time. I mean that the group was large and we sat and talked about these questions for a long time. I have named two comrades.

Finally, at the proposal of S.N. Baburin a commission for parliamentary investigation of circumstances for concluding a contract was formed.

At the evening sitting the deputies again returned to the decree worked out by the conciliation commission. Now the decree was named "On the Political Situation in the USSR." And again it was not adopted by a majority of the deputies upon voting. Why did the deputies not settle the matter? R.I. Khasbulatov, who was acting as chairman, noted that the problem is not the wording and that even the most liberal draft will not pass, because it is as though several deputies have decided to intentionally "block" the decree and "get the better of the parliament."

But the problem lies elsewhere. The Presidium has thrust its own point of view on the deputies. And the evaluation of events in the Baltic region and many other positions and formulations of the draft bill were unacceptable because they sinned against the truth. Its authors have forgotten that the "legally elected organs of government" in these republics have independently and without counsel from the people repealed the constitutions of the USSR and of these republics and begun to reestablish bourgeois systems similar to those in 1939. The peoples of these republics cannot reconcile themselves with this, that is the main thing. I believe this is the reason, not "obstinacy," that the RSFSR Supreme Soviet has again repudiated the draft decree presented to it. Discussion of the issue will now be continued in the separate chambers.

As for the parliamentary investigation, the newspaper SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA intends to follow it and inform the readers of it.

Polozkov Assesses Markets, Socialism

91UN0751B Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 22 Jan 91 First Edition p 2

[Article by I.K. Polozkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Communist Party of the RSFSR Central Committee: "Neither 'Introduce' Nor 'Ban'"]

[Text] In recent years liberal ideologists have been disseminating and introducing to people's minds a myth that is the direct opposite of that which has been instilled by many preceding decades. This is the myth of the market as an all-purpose socioeconomic mechanism allegedly automatically resolving all social contradictions and leading to universal happiness and abundance. It is our job, allegedly, merely to trigger this mechanism, having broken with the "administrative command system." How realistic are these promises?

The first experience of actions in this direction has already shown the groundlessness of the new, market dogmatism. The forcible, hurried campaign-style introduction of vulgarly understood market relations in many spheres and sectors of material production (not to mention the spheres of culture, education, and health care, which are in principle or mainly incompatible with the market) and the endless parade of compromises clinging to one another have led to the progressive disruption of natural ties and the joint-labor relations that had already taken shape between enterprises and a decline in the production of many vitally important products and items and brought about a hitherto unprecedented wave of departmental and localistic ambitions and group egotism. All this has contributed to the disintegration of the single all-Union market. The latter is still further proof that it is by no means a question of "temporary difficulties" but of the fact that all economic ailments cannot be treated with one and the same medicine. The market (and, sometimes, pseudomarket) "medicine," administered in horse-size doses, is stunning even the vital centers for which it is in principle salutary. Sweet dreams have resulted in bitter disappointment.

The whole point being that the market cannot be either "introduced" or "banned" by any decrees. It is a sum total of objective social relations between the participants in production arising, as necessary, at a particular level of the social division of labor and just as naturally becoming transformed and disappearing in line with the socialization of production and the strengthening of the coherence and interdependence of its individual components. There is, for example, no contract of sale relations in the subsistence, patriarchal economy. They become transformed and largely lose their market character even within the modern large industrial association-concern integrating dozens and hundreds of facilities frequently belonging to the most diverse sectors. The market is thus a historical category, which is manifested in various and increasingly complex forms. It has its own temporal and

structural limits, which are at the present time still very extensive, but by no means all-embracing.

Planned methods of management mitigating and blocking the anarchy of the spontaneous market are introduced at high levels of the development of production even under capitalism. Classical private property largely forfeits its positions, the state becomes the direct subject of regulation of social production as a whole and the market finds itself increasingly subject to the conscious principle and purposively oriented. It is indicative that the share of the state sector in individual sectors of the economy of the developed capitalist countries is quite appreciable.

Socialism as an economic system grows precisely from this trend, but is called upon to go considerably further. It is to eliminate the commodity form of manpower and thereby the source of the self-growth of capital—man's exploitation of man. The sphere of the buying and selling of the most important fixed production capital narrows also, which affords an opportunity for the regulation of production per a common all-state plan.

Nor can it be denied that the stratum of real market relations not removable by command or an effort of will persist under socialism and will persist into the foreseeable future. It is primarily a question of relations in the sectors, spheres, and types of production with a preponderance of enterprises insufficiently integrated among themselves by joint-labor intra- and intersectoral ties, that is, in the national economic zones where what Lenin called the coalescence of heterogeneous industries in a common social productive process has not yet been achieved. This market, as also, of course, the consumer goods and services market, has by no means disappeared. But it has been driven by voluntarist methods of management that ignore it into the economic underground and freed thereby from any public control whatever and has as a result partly gone into absolute decline and partly come to be dependent on profiteers. In a sense our market, if we consider its chaotic, spontaneous, uncivilized and rapacious nature, is considerably closer to its "classical norm" than in the modern West, which is today departing from the "pure" market and moving toward fundamentally new forms, the organization and regulation of social production, those borrowed from socialism included.

In the light of what has been said the formula of transition to the market appears in its true form. It is by no means a question of the fact that we lack a market, as the sphere of commodity-money relations, but of the fact that for the restoration of normal economic "circulation" it is essential to have done with anarchy and confusion, cleanse the market relations that actually exist of authoritarian-bureaucratic deformations and learn to regulate them by employing the whole arsenal known to world practice of economic methods of management.

A broad field of activity for communists is opened here. The party does not, of course, organize or direct the economy but it should act assertively, particularly in instances where the market begins to manifest itself destructively and when it strikes at the interests of the working people. It is important to determine what should be defended in every possible way and what, established. We will proceed firmly from the priority of the interests of the working majority and the priority of different forms of public ownership over private ownership, in a word, from the priority of the socialist choice.

The main thing, which must be prevented, is a long-term deterioration in the people's living conditions and mass unemployment, sharp social differentiation and a new division of society into the exploiter-rich and masses of exploited poor. The planned bases of expanded reproduction and all-state social and structural policy must under no circumstances be removed since this would simply deprive the country of important advantages and prospects of socio-economic progress.

Lately, a subject of particularly sharp argument has been the question of ownership of the land, which was, it might have seemed, settled long ago. In defining its position the Communist Party of the RSFSR proceeds from the fact that land is not a product of anyone's labor, is not reproducible by man, and does not have a price. This is part of living nature and a blessing given to people. It cannot be seen merely as an object of agricultural production and thereby be a subject of buying and selling or belong to anyone in the form of private capital. Granted all the diversity of forms of ownership and management and the multistructural nature of the economy in the agrarian sector, there should not be private ownership of the land. It is quite another matter when it is a question of the free transfer in legislative manner to collectives or citizens of plots of land for the production of agricultural produce and domestic or dacha activities for indefinite use, with the right of inheritance included. In instances of the tenant's return of the allotment to society, he should be compensated fully for expenditure connected with its development and improvement and maintenance at a particular level of fertility. The question of land is fundamental and has to be decided by the people, by way of referendum.

An urgent task, that should be tackled as quickly as possible, is the stabilization of the consumer market and the curbing of inflation. The prescriptions are well known throughout the world: monetary reform, stimulation of the production of goods and services, strict economic and administrative control of the balance of prices and incomes and state and local budgets, the attraction of money into savings, and so forth. But we are as yet agreeing to such measures timidly, slowly, and inconsistently.

A socialist state should not quit the market, it is required to preserve therein positions at least as strong as in the developed Western countries. The state must remain the

biggest owner of the means of production and the lawmaker and arbiter in the sphere of operation of market relations.

Western Republics

Belorussian Legislature Views Banknote Exchange

LD3101162591 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 31 Jan 91

[Excerpt] At the Belorussian Supreme Soviet, the results of the exchange of large-denomination banknotes was discussed. Vnuchko, chairman of the planning, finance, and budget commission, rejected rumors that a certain group of people knew about the decree being prepared. It was pointed out that thanks to the joint efforts of the offices of the postal services, the law-enforcement bodies, and the Belorussian KGB, all measures connected with the exchange were carried out at the stipulated time and did not cause any significant public disturbances. The factor of suddenness and shortage of time gave rise to a number of negative incidents. The main pockets of social tension were created by citizens in the southern republics of the USSR who did not have the opportunity to exchange large sums of ready cash, and citizens of Poland. [passage omitted]

Moldova Fails To Ratify Patrols Decree

LD3101134191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1310 GMT 31 Jan 91

[By MOLDOVA-PRESS-TASS correspondent Anatoliy Golia]

[Text] Kishinev, 31 Jan (TASS)—The USSR president's decree of 29 January 1991 "on cooperation of the militia and subunits of the Armed Forces in ensuring law and order and combating crime" has not been ratified and has been declared as "not having juridical force on the territory of Moldova from the moment of its adoption". This is today's decision of the Moldova Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet session.

Discussing this decree and the relevant orders of USSR Defense Minister Dmitriy Yazov and Minister of Internal Affairs Boris Pugo, deputies of Moldova's parliament came to the conclusion that in Moldova "there is no necessity for patrols by servicemen".

Ion Kostash, Moldovan minister of internal affairs, agreed that the level of crime in the republic was fairly high, but it had fallen somewhat in 1990 as compared with 1989, and there is no indication that it will grow. The Moldovan law "on the police" has already come into force, and this, the minister said, "is controlling the situation and so far the help of the military is not needed".

Moldova Republican Budget Law Examined

LD3101222491 Moscow TASS in English 2142 GMT 31 Jan 91

[By MOLDOVA-PRESS-TASS correspondent Anatoliy Golia]

[Text] Kishinev, 1 February TASS—Moldova's budget deficit will reach 400 million roubles this year, it was revealed during the promulgation of the republican law on the republic's budget for 1991.

Republican Finance Minister Valeriy Muravskiy said the deficit resulted from the allocation, in accordance with parliament decisions, of subsidies to fulfil social programmes and pay higher pensions and salaries to teachers and doctors. Another 170 million roubles will be needed to beef up material supplies to the police, the new law on which became effective on January 1, 1991.

"Serious problems arose after procurement prices for farm produce were raised," the minister noted. Retail prices for staples were expected to go up as well, but this did not happen. The republic had to subsidize sales of agricultural products, losing 200 million roubles in the process during the first 25 days of this year.

The law on budget envisages cuts in spending, including much smaller allocations for the upkeep of the administration mechanisms at all levels and local authorities.

Also on Thursday, the Moldovan parliament approved, after lengthy debates, the law on the state control department of the Soviet Socialist Republic of Moldova, which is due to go into effect on March 1.

The parliament continues work.

Readers Criticize Yeltsin's 'Destructive' Actions

PM3001104791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Jan 91 Second Edition p 2

[Selection of readers' letters under the rubric "Letters to the USSR President": "We Condemn This Provocative Policy!"]

[Text] The title of the selection of letters published below is taken from the words of the Vlasov, Golin, Lipetskiy, Dudar, Shvedov, Ivashkyavichene, and Burokas families and others living in Lithuania who have recently sent telegrams to USSR President M.S. Gorbachev with words of support for his policy. The senders of these telegrams condemn the actions of B.N. Yeltsin, who has recently taken and is continuing to take a number of unconstitutional measures. Similar telegrams and letters are being sent to the Kremlin by Soviet working people all over the country. We now publish some of those sent to PRAVDA from the presidential office.

"We condemn Yeltsin's actions, which are aimed at the disintegration of the Soviet Union and destabilization in the country and give support to rampant national

extremism in the Baltic. Political ambitions and constant confrontation with the USSR president are doing irreparable harm to perestroika. We regard Yeltsin's actions as a betrayal of the interests of the 1.5 million Russian-speakers living in the Baltics.

"We demand that a Supreme Soviet commission be set up to investigate and assess Yeltsin's actions. We support the working people who are fighting against the dictatorship of Landsbergis' legislature, which has brought suffering and irreplaceable loss to people of all nationalities."

[Signed] The Baltiya Shipyard Citizens' Defense Committee, Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU) Party Committee, and Yedinstvo Movement for Perestroika in Lithuania Council

"We resolutely condemn Yeltsin's irresponsible statements and destructive actions connected with the events in the Baltics. We demand that citizens' constitutional rights be guaranteed throughout the Soviet Union."

[Signed] Communists at the "Zavod Krasnodarselmash" Production Association, the Party Committee Building, 3 Sormovskaya Street, Krasnodar 38

"We reacted to Comrade Yeltsin's communication on the need to form RSFSR armed forces with a deep sense of outrage.

"Against whom are we intending to defend ourselves? Why do we forget the lessons of history and talk about a Union treaty and a united state, while we ourselves are splitting the Armed Forces into national compartments?"

"Shame on any policy that leads to confrontation between peoples!"

[Signed] The personnel of a military unit in Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk

"Yeltsin, Popov, Afanasyev, and Radio Rossii are increasing the country's destabilization and inciting civil war. We beg that these unlawful actions be suppressed and the bloodshed in the country stopped. We support the actions of the Army, the government, and the president in the Baltic."

[Signed] Voters in Murmansk (50 people) and Druchinin

"We do not agree with the basic content of the draft RSFSR Constitution proposed by Yeltsin's commission and leading to capitalism and the elimination of the Soviet Union.

"We are outraged by Yeltsin's actions, his fueling of emotions in the Baltic on Russia's behalf, and his provocative statements at the news conference.

"We would like to express our lack of confidence in Yeltsin."

[Signed] A meeting of Housing Management Section-6 (49 people), 69 Nekrasov Street, Vologda

"We are outraged by Yeltsin's statement about appealing to the United Nations and Russian members of the

Armed Forces. This has aggravated the situation in the country and the republic still further.

"We support USSR President Gorbachev, the Supreme Soviet, and the measures they are taking to stabilize the situation. We would like to express our profound condolences to the friends and relatives of those who have died."

[Signed] A group of workers at the Pastika Service Station, Dubossary.

Moldovan Deputies Receive Threats of Violence

LD3001201191 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 30 Jan 91

[Text] At the morning session of the Moldovan legislature today, members of the deputy-clubs of agrarians and independents demanded that their personal safety be guaranteed. The reason for this was an incident which took place yesterday evening. After a normal working day, the deputies were met outside the Supreme Soviet building by a group of excited people. Insults and open threats of physical violence were hurled at the parliamentarians. Those responsible for upholding law and order on this occasion did not consider it necessary to interfere. This reaction was governed by the fact that on Tuesday the majority of deputies at the session rejected a draft law on local self-government presented by the Druk government. Its adoption would have meant the virtual elimination of Soviet power and would have led to a further exacerbation of interethnic strife in Moldova.

Former Dissident Hits Moldovan 'Anticommunism'

PM3001143391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Jan 91 Union Edition p 1

[INTERFAX report from IZVESTIYA, TASS, REUTERS, UPI, INTERFAX, and POSTFAKTUM roundup: "Former Dissident Against Anticommunism"]

[Text] According to an INTERFAX report, Boris Marian, former Moldovan dissident and writer, has stated that "the anticommunism of People's Front forces, inspired in the main by deserters from the Communist Party, has lately been assuming the proportions of collective hysteria." His article, headed "A Specter Is Haunting Moldova," was published in the newspaper SOVETSKAYA MOLDOVA Thursday [24 January]. The party today is not the party of 1940 or even what it was two years ago, Marian writes. Communists condemn separatism and fight to develop national culture and achieve republic autonomy, but, as distinct from the other political formations, they do not inflate the national idea and constantly seek ways to unite rather than divide us, the article notes.

800 Romanians Seek Moldovan Citizenship

LD2801095891 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 28 Jan 91

[Text] According to a report from Kishinev, over 800 citizens from Bacau region of Romania have asked

Mircha Snegur, the president of Moldova, to grant them citizenship of the republic. Their petition was forwarded to (TSARA) the weekly newspaper published by the Moldova People's Front.

The petition, as published in the paper, expresses hope that once the citizenship law is adopted, roughly 1 million Romanians of Bessarabia, who left the territory of Moldova in 1940, as well as their direct descendants, will have their legal rights restored. It says that if the appropriate bodies in Romania were, in their turn, to grant Romanian citizenship to the inhabitants of Moldova, such steps would conform to the spirit of international law.

Caucasus

Georgian President Says Patrols Would Prompt War

LD0102094591 Budapest Domestic Service
in Hungarian 0900 GMT 1 Feb 91

[Text] The Georgian Armed Forces will prevent, if necessary through force, patrols in the republic by Soviet military and police formations. This was said by Georgian President Gamsakhurdia in an exclusive statement to NEPSZAVA. The parliament chairman said that the time for full independence had not yet come in Georgia, but if Moscow were to introduce patrol service, an open civil war would break out in the republic.

MVD Officer on Role of Troops in Ossetia

91UN0792A Moscow TRUD in Russian 26 Jan 90
p 2

[Report by TRUD correspondent O. Chikhladze on interview with A. Rostovtsev, officer with the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, MVD, in Tskhinvali; date not given: "There Are No 'Victors' in Tskhinvali"]

[Text] Tskhinvali—The South Ossetian problem has been passed on to the present Georgian legislature by the previous republic government. Subunits of Internal Troops were brought in to maintain order in Tskhinvali back in November 1989, but it was not possible to cool passions at that time. Passions have recently been heated to the limit. The city has been divided into zones, barricades and obstacles made from sandbags have been erected every 300 or 400 meters, and the number of dead and wounded is growing.

On the day your correspondent arrived in Tskhinvali there was intensive shooting throughout the city from evening to dawn. Ossetian militants had failed to keep their word: The day before they had promised that they would not open fire.

During the night a combat reconnaissance vehicle belonging to the Georgian militia was set on fire in a suburb of Tskhinvali in the zone controlled by the Ossetians, and in the morning I was taken in a similar

vehicle to the location of the incident. Representatives of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs were already there.

What is the role being played by USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs forces in Tskhinvali? It was with this question that I started a short interview with an officer from the Union Ministry of Internal Affairs, A. Rostovtsev, which, I think, will to some extent help to clarify the situation prevailing here.

[Rostovtsev] The Internal Troops are involved in the implementation of preventive measures, so to speak. Armored personnel carriers and infantry fighting vehicles are patrolling the city, and when these vehicles are seen, passions are calmed. Moreover, Internal Troops are located at the entrance to the city, monitoring who is entering Tskhinvali and why. This is their basic role now. The state of emergency declared by the Georgian Supreme Soviet is being implemented here by republic law enforcement forces. But if the situation deteriorates and the Internal Troops are forced to save people's lives, they will do that, but I emphasize that they will do it only under orders.

[Chikhladze] Well, what about the involvement, or rather lack of involvement, by USSR Internal Troops in removing the barricades and disarming the militants?

[Rostovtsev] Let us not get into operational matters. The militia should have information on who has weapons, but they will not be going house-to-house or seeking out every detachment. On this plane, both the Georgian militia and the USSR Internal Troops find themselves in a complex situation. There is no need yet for the Internal Troops to intervene. I repeat that a curfew has been imposed by the local law enforcement agencies. How it is enforced is another matter.

[Chikhladze] Why is it that for some days the Internal Troops have remained totally aloof from the patrols and gone back to their barracks?

[Rostovtsev] After republic law enforcement forces were brought in here and the USSR presidential ukase on their withdrawal was issued, for almost three days there was virtually no shooting, and the Internal Troops in fact were in their barracks. Then, on the night of 11-12 January, when major shooting started, the Internal Troops started to patrol the city. So how can we talk about remaining aloof here?

[Chikhladze] Is the curfew in the zones of Ossetia being observed?

[Rostovtsev] That is a complex question. It was Georgia, not Moscow, that declared the state of emergency, and it is the Georgian law enforcement agencies that should be ensuring observance of the regime.

[Chikhladze] If we speak in specific terms, it seems, does it not, that the curfew is not being observed in the zones of Ossetia?

[Rostovtsev] In principle, yes... I do not know how it has come about that only the city center and exit from it is being controlled by the Georgian militia. Evidently they do not have enough forces. It turns out that by coming here the Georgian militia is safeguarding itself...

[Chikhladze] And why is it that the Georgian militia is not being helped by subunits of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs in ensuring that the curfew is observed throughout the territory of the city?

[Rostovtsev] For this it is necessary that the Georgian Government ask the Union government, and that the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs troops receive corresponding orders. There are no such orders. Georgia's decision to declare a state of emergency cannot serve as justification for actions by USSR Internal Troops.

[Chikhladze] Can we predict the situation in the days immediately ahead?

[Rostovtsev] We must bear in mind that both sides have, for example, negative forces that do not want stabilization of the situation, do not want calm. For all that is needed is just one shot, and immediately shooting starts throughout the city. So no one can offer any guarantee of calm...

We shall not end on a somber note. A solution can be found to the situation. The main thing is not to indulge in vain hopes. The USSR Supreme Soviet commission has finally arrived in Tskhinvali and started its work. Without running ahead of events, let me express the opinion shared by many, namely that the barricades must be brought down as quickly as possible and the weapons taken from the militants so that we can put a stop to the fratricide, which is of advantage only to those who are pursuing their own ambitious goals. Otherwise the knot will be drawn so tight that it will have to be cut. And then events will unfold according to quite another scenario...[end Rostovtsev]

Yesterday, when this material was already in the editorial office, a report was carried on republic television. It stated that as a result of the mutual trust achieved between the Georgian Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Ossetian side, subunits of the Georgian militia will be withdrawn from the region and seized weapons will be surrendered.

Russian-Language Paper Closed Down in Georgia

PM2901140991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
26 Jan 91 Second Edition p 2

[Report by TASS correspondent A. Kochetkov: "Offensive Against Glasnost?"]

[Text] Tbilisi, 25 Jan—MOLODEZH GRUZII, the oldest Russian-language newspaper in the republic, has ceased to exist.

The local government has decided to merge it with ZARYA VOSTOKA and to call the new organ of the

republic Supreme Soviet VESTNIK GRUZII. The grounds for eliminating the newspaper were its independent stance and its criticisms of the new power in Georgia.

At the republic Supreme Soviet Press Center the position of the youth newspaper's editorial collective is viewed as antidemocratic and directed against the new parliament. The journalists are accused of not reflecting the interests of Georgian young people as, from its very creation, the newspaper was the organ of the now disbanded republic Lenin Communist Youth League and...the USSR KGB.

Similar accusations were also leveled at the editorial board earlier, and the newspaper was hit both "from the left" and "from the right": The independence of its judgments and the fact that it made its pages available for opposition articles both "before" and "after" the point when the new parliament set the aim of dismantling Soviet power in Georgia were given a hostile reception by the opposing sides—they all caught it in equal measure from MOLODEZH GRUZII's brave journalists. This was why, even under the former authority, the newspaper was denied registration on various pretexts.

The paper shortage was such a pretext this time. In Georgia, however, it has affected Russian-language newspapers more. Anticipating charges of oppressing Russian-language newspapers, the Press Center of the republic parliament officially called them slander. Let us point out that the closed-down newspaper had the largest number of subscribers of all the republic newspapers outside Georgia.

All the popular newspapers in the republic, with the exception of TSKHOVREB ("Life")—organ of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee—are now under the control of the legislature or the government.

Armenian Legislature Rejects Union Referendum

NC0102114391 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian
1730 GMT 31 Jan 91

[Declaration by the Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet on the USSR Supreme Soviet's 16 January decision to hold a referendum on preserving the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; place and date not given]

[Text] Noting that the question posed by the referendum is formulated imprecisely and requires the expression of a serious counterargument and stance concerning a number of problems of principle, and,

Considering that in line with Article 29 of the USSR law on the referendum in the USSR the result of the referendum is final and binding in all the Soviet Union and could only be amended by a new referendum in the Soviet Union and that as such this referendum precludes

the exercise of the right to self-determination by the republics, autonomous formations, and by the peoples in general,

The Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet considers the question of the referendum of 17 March on preserving the Soviet Union as unprepared [chnakhapatrastvats] and that it is unacceptable for the referendum to be held.

Armenian Premier Rejects Draft Union Treaty

*NC3001135891 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian
1730 GMT 29 Jan 91*

[Text] Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Australia to the USSR Charles Robin Ashwin is visiting Armenia with his wife.

Levon Ter-Petrosyan, chairman of the Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet, received the ambassador on 29 January. During their warm conversation, the president of the republic familiarized the guest with the current situation in Armenia and with those measures adopted by the ruling national-democratic forces which aim to stabilize the political and economic situation in the republic set on the course of independence and to create a law-governed sovereign state. There are serious difficulties, mostly from without, on how to achieve this objective, he said. Much depends on the form of relations to be established between the center and the republics. Levon Ter-Petrosyan considered the proposed draft Union treaty as unacceptable, stressing that the republics will go on signing direct agreements with each other and will themselves decide what (?suits them).

Referring to the existing ethnic problems in the Soviet Union, the president noted that these are not exclusively domestic affairs and that their solution also depends on the stance of the outside world.

The establishment of the immediate and direct relations between the republics and foreign countries was considered to be of priority importance.

The guest was particularly interested in the problem of Artsakh [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast]. In reply to the ambassador's inquiry, the president of the republic underlined that confrontation would achieve no result and that it is necessary to chose the road of negotiations. Unfortunately, the center is creating serious obstacles in this direction. At present, a military dictatorship has been established in Nagorno-Karabakh, and the legitimate administration has been removed. In such a situation it is impossible to resume negotiations.

The issue of developing direct relations between Australia and Armenia and establishing ties in various areas was also raised during the conversation.

Finally, Levon Ter-Petrosyan expressed his satisfaction over Australian authorities' amiable and warm treatment of the Armenian community and over Australia's humanitarian assistance to the earthquake-stricken Armenian people. He expressed the conviction that the ties between Armenia and Australia will be consolidated in the future.

Australia's ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary expressed appreciation for the warm reception and the opportunity accorded him to get acquainted with life in the Armenian Republic.

On the same day, the ambassador visited the Armenian Republic's Foreign Affairs Ministry and spoke with Deputy Foreign Minister Yegiazaryan. In the afternoon, the high-level guest visited Edzhmiatsin and met the Catholicos of All the Armenians Vazgen I. In the evening the guest met with Ambardzum Galstyan, chairman of the Yerevan City Soviet, in the building of the executive committee of Yerevan City Soviet of People's Deputies.

Foteyev Meets With Officers in Stepanakert

*LD3001143991 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1400 GMT 30 Jan 91*

[Text] Foteyev, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and chairman of the Union-level commission for monitoring and observing the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, has met officers of the internal troops of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs in Stepanakert. The servicemen complained about the prolonged stay by internal troops in Nagorno-Karabakh and about problems of the social protection of staff who are carrying out the task of stabilizing the situation in the region under a state of emergency with risk to their life. The officers' proposals, as Comrade Foteyev stressed, will be used to the maximum during the preparation of documents on the situation in Nagorno-Karabakh for examination at the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Azerbaijan, Turkey Sign Cooperation Protocol

*NC2901163091 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri
0440 GMT 29 Jan 91*

[From the republican press review]

[Text] The Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic and Turkey have signed a cooperation protocol in Nakhichevan. Kasumov, head of the Azeri [word indistinct] Consumers Union, was interviewed on the contents of the agreement signed between the two governments by an AZERINFORM correspondent. The interview is published in today's newspapers.

Central Asia

Uzbekistan Supports 17 Mar Referendum

*PM3101110191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
30 Jan 91 Second Edition p 8*

[Report by correspondent A. Kaipbergenov: "Preparing for Referendum"]

[Text] Tashkent—The Uzbek Supreme Soviet Presidium has supported the Union parliament's resolution on holding a referendum 17 March on the retention of the USSR as a federation of equal republics. Some 226 districts have been formed. The powers of the republican referendum commission have been assigned to the Central Electoral Commission for the election of Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic deputies.

Turkmen Draft Law on Local Self-Management

924A0235A

For the Turkmen Draft Law on Local Self-Management published in the 30 October issue of TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA, see the JPRS Report Soviet Union: Economic Affairs, JPRS-UEA-91-004, pages 31-38.

Uzbek Law on Trade Abuses, Speculation

914A0207A

For the Uzbek Law on Trade Abuses and Speculation published in the 16 November issue of PRAVDA VOSTOKA, see the JPRS Report Soviet Union: Economic Affairs, JPRS-UEA-91-004, pages 41-43.